

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

643. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the Earl Fruit Co., of Sacramento, Calif., urging appropriation to purchase experimental vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

644. Also, petition of Leemoore Post, No. 100, American Legion, Leemoore, Calif., urging relief for the disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

645. Also, petition of Bakersfield (Calif.) Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, urging the passage of House bill 2412; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

646. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition of the National Grain Dealers' Association, for Congress to repeal law creating Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

647. Also, petition of Washington Congregational Church, Toledo, Ohio, urging Congress to take immediate steps for disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

648. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the California State American War Mothers, favoring relief for the disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

649. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of the First National Bank and others, of St. Joseph, Mo., opposing the Tincher bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

650. Also, telegrams from A. J. Elevator Co., the Geiger Grain Co., and the St. Joseph Grain Exchange, all of St. Joseph, Mo., protesting against the enactment of the Tincher bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

651. By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 4014, for the relief of Mrs. Aletta Ann Query; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

652. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Ukrainian Society of Scouts; St. Peter and Paul's Ukrainian Church; American-Ukrainian local committee, of Carnegie, Pa.; and the Ukrainian Society of Transfiguration, Show Mine, Pa., all protesting against the Polish occupation of Ukrainian East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

653. Also, petition of the American Ukrainian Society, of Carnegie, Pa., regarding conditions in East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

654. By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution adopted by the Corporal Spencer Bloor Post, No. 491, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, protesting against the United States entering into a treaty of peace with Germany until Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, the notorious millionaire slacker, is delivered to the authorities of this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

655. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the California Grape Protective Association, relative to the experimental vineyards located near Fresno and Oakville, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

656. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging improvement of the channel between Blackwells Island and Negro Point Bluff, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

657. By Mr. KING: Petition of citizens of the eighth district of the State of Illinois, praying for the amendment to the Volstead Act to permit light wines, beer, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

658. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing the Walsh bill, for the damming of Yellowstone Lake, in Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

659. Also, petition of the American Dyes Institute, New York City, urging the protection of the dye industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

660. Also, petition of the National Physical Education Service, Washington, D. C., urging support of the Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

661. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., urging support of House bill 30; also Senate bill 1084; to the Committee on Budget.

662. Also, petition of the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, Washington, D. C., urging support of the Shepard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

663. Also, petition of Frank N. West, East San Diego, Calif., urging support of House bill 285; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

664. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to defect in section 206 (c) of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

665. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of the L. L. Tillman Post, No. 900, American Legion, Akron, N. Y., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; also of the Grain Dealers' National Association of Toledo, Ohio, urging legislation for repeal of the law creating the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

666. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the American Committee for Relief in Ireland urging support of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Petition of the New York State Federation of Labor, urging support of H. R. 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary. Petition of the American Association for Labor Legislation, New York City, urging passage of H. R. 4089 and S. 847; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

667. By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of the Harlem Board of Commerce, New York City, urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

668. By Mr. SNELL: Resolution of John E. Harrica Post, No. 875, American Legion, Chateaugay, N. Y., for relief of disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

669. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the Ukrainian Society of Herkimer, N. Y., with reference to affairs in eastern Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

670. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of 30 citizens of Boston, Mass., favoring the recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

671. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of citizens of the eleventh congressional district of the State of Massachusetts urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

672. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the Abington Monthly Meeting of Friends, Jenkintown, Pa., opposing military training being introduced in the schools, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

673. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of 440 citizens of Milford, Mass., favoring the recognition by the United States Government of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 13, 1921.

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 12, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5676) taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery, and options for such contracts, and providing for the regulation of boards of trade, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate, and that Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. LONGWORTH, Mr. GARNER, and Mr. COLLIER were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the National Milk Marketing Conference held at Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1921, favoring the enactment of legislation placing a tariff on agricultural products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of the Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, and Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 412, both of Pittsburgh, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, Abilene, Enterprise, Beattie, Axtell, and Baileyville, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation

to prevent gambling in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Library of Congress Branch, Federal Employees' Union, of Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation permitting employees of the Government to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS presented resolutions of the Rotary Club of Akron and the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, both in the State of Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MOSES presented a resolution of Grand Army Post No. 41, of Londonderry and Derry, N. H., favoring the enactment of legislation looking toward world peace, particularly the reduction of armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a resolution of the Pine Bluff Automotive Dealers' Association, of Pine Bluff, Ark., favoring the enactment of legislation to equalize the differences in the marketing of salvaged automotive equipment, so as to afford protection to the Government as well as to the automotive industry, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts favoring international disarmament, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Unity Center of New Thought, of Springfield, Mass., opposing the present naval program and a large standing Army, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Society, Sons of the American Revolution, of Boston, Mass., favoring the changing of the name of the Panama Canal to the "Roosevelt Canal" as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also presented resolutions of Thomas Clark Branch, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of New Bedford, and George Washington and St. Andrew's Councils, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Roslindale, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation for the recognition of the Irish Republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Mass., relative to the case of East Galicia, praying for the recognition by the United States of the West Ukrainian republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1769) to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia, in cases of subdivision or sales of land therein; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1770) to authorize deduction of war-risk insurance premiums from the war-service bonus payable under the act approved February 24, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1771) to authorize the United States, through the United States Shipping Board, to acquire a site on Hazzell Island, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, for a fuel and fuel-oil station and fresh-water reservoir for Shipping Board and other merchant vessels, as well as United States naval vessels, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1772) authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases;

A bill (S. 1773) to provide and adjust penalties for violation of various navigation laws, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1774) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes,' approved February 13, 1911," approved February 7, 1920; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1775) to provide for causes of action arising out of Federal control and operation of telegraph and telephone

systems during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1776) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1777) granting a pension to Mrs. E. L. D. Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1778) for the relief of Elizabeth Foster Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1779) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1780) to authorize the erection of an experimental oil-shale refining plant at Ogden, Utah, and making an appropriation for such purpose; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 1781) making appropriation for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Ephraim, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1782) to appoint Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett, United States Army, retired, to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 1783) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Heubach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 1784) for the relief of John B. Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1785) for the relief of Elizabeth H. Rice; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 1786) for the relief of Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1787) to amend an act approved May 18, 1920, entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1788) to incorporate "The Big Brother and Big Sister Federation," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) authorizing a joint committee of both Houses to investigate the Harriman Geographic Code System, now in use by the War Department, with a view to ascertaining the adaptability and application of said system in the several executive departments and administrative branches of the Government, and to rendering a just compensation to the owner thereof; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment providing that all orders or contracts for the manufacture of material pertaining to approved projects, heretofore or hereafter placed with Government-owned establishments, shall be considered as obligations in the same manner as provided for similar orders placed with commercial manufacturers, and the appropriation shall remain available for the payment of the obligations so created as in the case of contracts or orders with commercial manufacturers, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5676) taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery, and options for such contracts, and providing for the regulation of boards of trade, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment found on page 35, line 7.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.



The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Sheppard
Ball	Gorry	McNary	Shields
Borah	Gooding	Moses	Shortridge
Broussard	Hale	Nelson	Smith
Bursum	Harrell	Newberry	Spencer
Cameron	Harris	Nicholson	Stanfield
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Stanley
Caraway	Hefflin	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Johnson	Oddie	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Phipps	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	Keyes	Poindexter	Williams
Dillingham	King	Pomerene	Willis
Ernst	Ladd	Ransdell	Wolcott
Fernald	La Follette	Reed	
Fletcher	McKellar	Robinson	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. STAMMONS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent in attendance on a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHIPPS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained on business of the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is unavoidably absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the particular item before the Senate is the item on page 35 providing for an increase of \$7,500,000 for fuel and transportation, the exact figures being \$17,500,000 as provided by the House, and an increase is made by the Senate committee to \$25,000,000. I wish to submit some observations upon the increases in the bill, and as a number of amendments providing for increases have been passed over, I presume it is as logical to state them now as at any time.

The House bill carries \$396,000,000, in round figures about \$400,000,000. That is, as it seems to some of us, a very large appropriation for the Navy at this time, almost three times as much as we expended for the Navy in 1913.

The bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs increases the amount by about \$100,000,000, making the total for the Navy about \$500,000,000; to be exact I think it is \$496,000,000. There is not very much information afforded the Senate in the report of the committee as to why these increases were made. In fact, in regard to this particular item no information is furnished the Senate. In regard to all the items, scarcely any information whatever is provided in the report as to the increases. Without assuming to criticize the committee, of course, it would seem that for an increase of \$100,000,000 over the amount provided by the House and by a committee of the House that is known to be very aggressively in favor of a big Navy, there ought to be very strong and conclusive reasons stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to say that I did not catch the entire amount appropriated in the bill as he stated it.

Mr. BORAH. About \$500,000,000—four hundred and ninety-six million and some odd dollars, but when we taken into consideration the commitments in the bill, the expenditures which must inevitably follow, in my opinion the bill carries \$650,000,000, but the actual figures as the proponents of the bill present them are, in round numbers, \$500,000,000.

For instance, let me call attention to the increase in the personnel. The personnel of the French Navy is about 45,000 men; that of the Japanese Navy, from 75,000 to 80,000 men; and that of the British Navy, about 100,000 or 105,000 men. It is variously estimated, but the most accurate figures which I have been able to secure and which I think are reliable are 105,000.

The British Navy, of course, is now, as the ships are counted and as the proponents of a large navy in this country express it, a very much larger navy than that of the United States. The British Navy has a very much extended service to perform and particularly since the ratification of the Versailles treaty, because Great Britain is now master of one-third of the land of the world and about one-fourth of its population.

So we are providing and the House provided for a personnel of 100,000 men. That would be to all practical purposes the size of the largest navy in the world, to wit, the British Navy, lacking about 5,000 men.

It is now proposed to increase the Navy personnel to 120,000 men. I submit that, whatever may be one's views with reference to a large Navy, it does seem to me that in these times, when every effort ought to be made that can be made in reasonableness and safety to curtail the expenditures of the Government we can afford to limit our personnel to the size of the personnel of the English Navy, which is now the largest navy in the world. When we are cutting expenses, or at least have promised to cut expenses wherever we can, and when we know that we must deprive the Government of certain appropriations which it really ought to have for civic, industrial, and educational purposes, it seems to me that even the advocates of a great navy ought to be willing to rest with a personnel equal in size to that of the greatest navy in the world.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator whether the figures which he is giving include officers as well as men—whether they include the whole personnel?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean of the British Navy?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I understand they simply include the men. I am quite sure of that.

Mr. KENYON. What is the number of the personnel of the Japanese Navy?

Mr. BORAH. It is from seventy-five to eighty thousand men.

Mr. KENYON. Does that include the air service and all other branches?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

We are, therefore, providing not only a Navy equal in personnel to the greatest navy in the world, but we are now surpassing it by from fifteen to twenty thousand men. The only excuse for that as assigned by the able proponents of the pending bill is that if we do not have this personnel certain ships will lie idle; in other words, in a time of peace, at a time when economy is absolutely essential to prevent bankruptcy and distress becoming widespread and extended throughout the country, we prefer to keep afloat, as a matter of exhibition and parade, certain ships rather than to save the taxpayers and permit those ships, as the British have permitted their ships to do, to lie idle. If, Mr. President, we now have 120,000 men to keep the ships which we have afloat and in condition, pray advise the American taxpayer the number we shall have to have when 16 additional battleships shall have been finished. We are creating what is known here in Washington as perpetual motion in appropriations. This is the method by which these expenditures are now continually increasing.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. One of the reasons for maintaining the personnel is to supply the new ships which are approaching completion. When we recruit a lot of seamen, it is necessary to give them some little training before they can be put on a battleship to operate it. I assume that when the new ships are completed, and we have them available for service in the Navy, some of the older ships will be dealt with, as the Senator from Idaho recommends.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I have no doubt that some of the old ships will be regarded as obsolete just as soon as the new ships can take their places. The thought occurred to me, however, I will say to the Senator, in view of the distressed condition of the taxpayers of the country, and in view of the fact that we are not now at least contemplating a naval war with any other nation, that we might permit these ships to be discarded, as the British have already done as to theirs of a similar type.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have just suggested that probably we would adopt that suggestion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The only difference between the able Senator from Washington and myself is that I should like to adopt it now and to limit the personnel to 100,000 men.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We could not do that in one day or in one month. It is necessary to take some time in order to prepare men and to discard ships and get new ones and to man new ones.

Mr. BORAH. Have there been any steps taken toward putting out of commission any of the obsolete ships?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator in mind those particular ships?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not give the Senator from Idaho the names of the ships. I have the data here which I can supply the Senator. Included in the list are a number of the older ships, particularly a great number—something like 100—of destroyers, most of which bear the names of officers of the Navy. I can supply the names to the Senator from Idaho if he desires.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, I shall be glad to have them, because it is very difficult for a layman to know what ships are

obsolete and what are not until the experts have passed upon the question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not mean to say that the destroyers to which I have referred are obsolete. I mean to say that they are being put in reserve; they are being protected; they are being preserved against destruction; but they are not being kept in full commission.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the British Navy, which the proponents of a large Navy in this country say now is very much larger and more powerful than ours, is getting along with a personnel of 105,000 men. When it comes to seamanship and to adequacy of defense from the seamen's standpoint, I think we may safely rely upon the strength of the British Navy as being ample to secure the British possessions. If that be true, what possible reason can be assigned for the United States adding 20,000 men to the number which the British Navy regards as a sufficient and efficient personnel in order to protect all the wide-flung British possessions?

Mr. President, the condition in this country is a very serious one. There are at present, it is said, 5,000,000 men in the United States who are out of employment. I read this morning a statement by a priest, in which he stated publicly that in his entire parish there were only seven men employed, and that the people were not only out of employment but that they were hungry and that some of them were actually starving. This condition, Mr. President, has become chronic, and is only preceding a more general condition that will come about, as indicated by the conditions which confront us in West Virginia this morning.

If the people of this country were satisfied that the Congress was doing what it could do to limit their burdens and expenses, I feel very certain that they would be patient to the very limit in regard to existing conditions, but at a time when business is discouraged, when industry is demoralized, when we are searching for more money in the way of taxes, and when the army of the unemployed bids fair to be as large as the Army of the fighting forces a few months ago, it is very difficult to justify the increase of the House appropriation, which was already large, by \$100,000,000. The psychological effect as well as the actual effect of such things, in view of the distressed condition of the people of the country, is something that one does not like to contemplate.

The Secretary of the Treasury made a report a few days ago, and I invite the attention particularly of Senators upon this side of the Chamber to a paragraph or two from that report.

Mr. Mellon has been a marvelous success in the world of finance in his individual capacity, and I doubt not that he has given to this subject thorough investigation and the best effort possible to arrive at a business basis upon which to operate the Government. He says:

The Nation can not continue to spend at this shocking rate—

And yet, Mr. President, there is positively no chance in this Congress at the rate which we are traveling to lower the expenditures by one dollar. We will cut here and there a little, but one has only to look at the bills which are pending before Congress, and which will pass, to know that at the end of this fiscal year the expenditures for the actual running expenses of the Government will be greater than they were in 1920. If there is any plan upon this side of the Chamber being incubated anywhere to limit the expenditures of the Government it has not yet been revealed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Is not the Senator mistaken about that? I remember very distinctly that at the last session of the Senate, as the Senator from Idaho no doubt will remember, I was very much interested in trying to secure an increase in the pay of a few policemen out in the Zoological Park, but the Senate was so economical at the time that they would not permit that increase. The mere fact that we are expending four hundred million or five hundred million dollars for the Navy in one session of Congress should not make the Senator from Idaho lose sight of the very striking exhibition of economy to which I have referred.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, and I modify my remarks to that extent. Secretary Mellon continues:

The Nation can not continue to spend at this shocking rate. As the President said in his message, the burden is unbearable and there are two avenues of relief. "One is rigid resistance in appropriation and the other is the utmost economy in administration." This is no time for extravagance or for entering upon new fields of expenditure. The Nation's finances are sound and its credit is the best in the world, but it can not afford reckless or wasteful expenditure. New or enlarged expenditures can not be financed without increased taxes or new loans. Expenditures should not even be permitted to continue at the present rate. The country is staggering under the existing burden of taxation and debt and clamoring for gradual relief from the war taxation.

The Nation should not be permitted to continue to expend at its present rate, and the people are staggering, says the Secretary of the Treasury, under the load which they are now carrying. Yet I submit that we have not before us any plan or any program which permits of even a limitation of expenditures to the present figure.

We were advised a few weeks ago by a member of the Finance Committee, who presented the figures, that this year we would appropriate \$4,500,000,000, and that at the end of the year we would have a deficit of from \$1,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000. The best figures which can be gathered by those who have the courage and are willing to present them is that this Republican Congress, pledged to economy, will increase the expenditures of 1920.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator, of course, knows that the appropriations for 1922 have already been made, with the exception of those for the Navy and for the Army; and he knows, furthermore, that they were made upon estimates furnished by officials of the former administration. If the Senator will take the time to look at the figures, he will find that the estimates sent in were very materially decreased in all the appropriation bills which were passed. I can speak for all of the bills except the Army appropriation bill, the Navy appropriation bill, and the Diplomatic and Consular bill. Those bills I can not speak about, because I have not the figures at hand, and they did not come before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OVERMAN. We always appropriate less than the estimates; that is always done by every Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; of course. Mr. President, in answer to the able Senator from Kansas I will simply repeat—and I put it here in the RECORD, and I ask the Senator from Kansas in a year from now to read it—that the expenditures of this Congress, for which the Republicans are responsible, will be greater than the expenditures of the preceding Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the prediction that the expenditures will be a billion dollars less than they were this year. The first time the Republicans prepare the appropriation bills upon estimates from their departments the reduction will be over a billion dollars. I make that prediction.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment, until I get through with this. The expenditures of the last Congress were passed upon by an overwhelmingly Republican Congress, and to say that the estimates were sent in here by Democratic officials and afterwards were cut to some extent by a Republican Congress does not relieve the Republican Congress at all from the fact of the expenditures as made by the Republican Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have before me the figures, and they show that the appropriations, outside the Army and Navy bill which we have made for 1922, are \$898,000,000 below the appropriations for 1921.

Mr. BORAH. Eight hundred and ninety-eight million dollars? Bless Heaven—\$898,000,000!—and you will see a billion and a half of deficiencies appropriated here without a single effective protest.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there is a bill for \$300,000,000 of deficiencies pending now in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether those figures include the naval bill and the Army bill?

Mr. CURTIS. No; they do not.

Mr. KENYON. So you would have to deduct those from the \$800,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. It is \$800,000,000 less than was carried in the bills outside the Navy and Army bills. I said in my first statement that I could not speak for the Army bill or the Navy bill or the Diplomatic bill, because they did not come before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KENYON. I did not understand from the Senator whether he included the figures of the Army and the Navy or not.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not; only the bills that were actually passed and which came before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. How much has the naval appropriation bill of the present Congress been reduced below the naval appropriation bill of the last session?



Mr. BORAH. Not a dollar—not a dollar. It stands right where it stood.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, of course I do not know what the Senator from Ohio refers to as "the naval bill." The bill as it came to the Senate from the House contained a reduction of nearly \$100,000,000. The bill as reported by the Senate committee, including new program and new construction for aviation, is very nearly the same as the appropriations of last year.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, the estimates which came from a Democratic administration result in the same bill and the same appropriations as the estimates which came from a Republican administration. There is no difference between the two bills.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that under a Democratic administration in 1914-15 the naval appropriation bill was only \$141,000,000, and the year before \$136,000,000, and the year before \$129,000,000, and so on back to 1900, when it was \$61,000,000. Now it is more than \$500,000,000, besides commitments which will necessitate an expenditure of \$2,000,000,000 in the next two years.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in the sweep of the years, in the change of Democratic administrations and Republican administrations, taxes continue to increase year by year and decade by decade. Let me call your attention to some figures which indicate how little party politics have to do with decreasing expenditures.

In 1850 the per capita expenditures of the National Government were \$1.77.

In 1860 they were \$2.01.

In 1890, \$4.75 per capita.

In 1900, \$6.39 per capita.

In 1910, \$7.30 per capita.

In 1919, \$144.77 per capita.

It makes no difference, Mr. President, so far as parties are concerned. If you look back over 50 years, there is a constant rise in the expenditures of the National Government in the per capita burden upon the people. Whether the estimates come from one party or another or are passed by one party or another, when it gets down to the taxpayer there is an increase of burden, regardless of what party is in power.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator should not be discouraged. This amount is raised by direct taxes levied upon the people. Cheer up; the worst is yet to come. These taxes are but a fraction of the indirect burden.

For instance, under the transportation act of 1920, which has operated, according to the testimony before the committee, but one-twelfth of the time, there has been an increase in rates of \$400,000,000. If it had operated for a full year, there would have been an increase of practically \$4,000,000,000. Mr. Hines has estimated that we pay \$5 out of our pockets for every dollar of increase in freight rates. That would be an increase in freight rates of \$20,000,000,000 under one act; so that the little amount the Government takes directly is so small compared with the amount we are taking indirectly that we should not be discouraged or dismayed.

Mr. BORAH. No; in view of the fact that both sides of the Chamber passed the bill.

Mr. STANLEY. I helped do it. I am not pleading "not guilty."

Mr. BORAH. I continue reading from the Secretary of the Treasury:

The estimated ordinary expenditures of \$4,014,000,000 will on their part be affected by appropriations which are still to be made. The estimated expenditures of the War Department and the Navy Department, aggregating over \$1,100,000,000 for 1922, will depend largely upon the military and naval policy adopted by the Congress at the present session. \* \* \* In the absence of drastic cuts in military and naval expenditures, there is almost no prospect, according to the estimates, of any substantial available surplus even in the fiscal year 1922. \* \* \* Substantial cuts in current expenditures offer the only hope of effective relief from the tax burden.

The President has told us that this tax situation is unbearable. The Secretary of the Treasury has advised us that this shocking expenditure can not continue, and the Secretary of the Treasury has advised us that there is no place to reduce it except in the Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he thinks the Shipping Board offers any opportunities for reduction of expenditures?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know. I am referring to the language of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury says there is no way to cut expenditures except in these two items. I presume he has surveyed the situation with some degree of accuracy and earnestness. It depends upon him, in a large measure, to see that there are presented to Congress the things which ought to be presented in order to reduce expenditures.

Being thus advised, what does this side of the Chamber propose to do?

A vast amount has been said about cooperation and harmony and teamwork, and we have a great deal of harmony and teamwork on certain matters; but on the question of expenditures we are in utter disharmony. One department of the Government is insisting upon increased expenditures, or holding them to the present level, and another department of the Government advises us that it simply can not be endured, and that this shocking expenditure will lead to disaster. The Secretary of War, who is also a student of finance and has been a success in it, in a speech made a short time ago said:

Something like \$17,000,000,000 must be provided by the Federal Government within the next 30 months to meet its running expenses and refunding operations. This—

Said Secretary Weeks—

is an infinitely greater task than was ever undertaken by any nation in the world in time of peace, and there is no one, skilled in financial operations though he may be, who does not view the prospect with more or less alarm. With this situation facing us it is the height of folly to undertake new commitments if they can be avoided, and I assume that no one will dissent from that proposition.

Seventeen billions of dollars in 30 months, the beginning of which 30 months is marked by discouragement and by demoralization in the industrial and business world. Senators here know that sources of taxation are being dried up day by day; that taxes which have come to us from a certain source come to us from that source no longer, because they say they are not there to give. Men who a few months ago were paying a large income tax would be delighted if they could turn their property over to those who hold a mortgage and step out free. I know men in my part of the country, sir, who a year or two years ago were what we call very wealthy men for our part of the country. They are now in financial ruin. One of them drove his herd into a field a few days ago, a man who was estimated to be worth \$1,500,000 a year and a half ago, and said to the mortgagee, "You can take it; I am going to the oil wells of Texas." That is only one of many illustrations; and yet, my friends, without any program, without any plan to lift the burden from the men who are bending under it, without even stopping to listen to the appeals which are made to us, we sit here day by day not only not decreasing the expenditures but increasing them—a party which was pledged in the last campaign in every way to economy.

Mr. President, the able chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who, unfortunately, by reason of ill health, is detained from the Senate, in an interview upon this question of disarmament the other day said, "My opinion is that the American people are just now more concerned in getting revenue revised and taxes reduced and the sheriff retired to the background than they are in academic discussion of disarmament."

As I said, the able Senator, the chairman of the Finance Committee, being absent on account of ill health, I address my question to any member of the Finance Committee who is here, or who ought to be here. How do you propose to retire the sheriff? What is your plan? If disarmament is not the plan, what is your plan? Certainly the Senator from Pennsylvania would not be in favor of the United States fully disarming without an agreement among the other nations to disarm, and if you do not have it through agreement it is altogether probable you can not have it at all. You can take the word of the Secretary of the Treasury that unless disarmament comes through such an agreement we can not have any reduction at all in our taxes.

It has been stated here before, and I want to state it again, that it may go into the Record, that 93 per cent of the money expended by the Government during the year 1920 was on account of wars, past and future, closed and anticipated; 7 per cent for all the other operations of the Government, civic, educational, and everything which has to do with the building up of a Government and maintaining it.

The cost of all the civil-service activities of the Government from July 1, 1909, to July 1, 1919, averaged \$2.15 a year per capita, and during that period the cost increased practically with the population. From 1834 to and through 1919, the War Department actually disbursed \$23,002,390,008. In the same



period the Navy Department expended \$6,907,369,032. This makes a total for those two departments of \$29,909,759,040.

Now, Mr. President, for comparison, the total cost of the Civil War, from June 30, 1861, to June 30, 1866, was \$3,500,000,000. I have somewhere the total expenditures of the Government for the first 72 years of its existence, which is a little more than the increase in this naval appropriation bill.

The net cost of the World War to the United States was, up to January 1, 1921, \$24,010,000,000. According to the appropriations passed prior to May 1, 1920, including the deficiency bill, our expenditure for that year was \$5,686,576,000. Of this expenditure there was expended for the War and Navy Departments \$1,424,138,667.57, or 25 per cent of the entire amount; \$3,855,482,000, or 67 per cent, was for previous wars, in the way of pensions, and so forth. For primary governmental functions \$181,000,000 was expended, in round figures, or 43 per cent of the entire expenditures of the Government. There was expended for public works, \$168,203,557.46, or 2.097 per cent of the entire amount. For research and educational development work there was expended \$57,093,660, or 1.001 per cent of the entire expenditures.

For research, for educational work, for the building of citizenship, for the building of character upon which republican institutions must rest, we appropriate 1 per cent of the entire expenditures of five billion and odd dollars, and 93 per cent for war.

Now I ask you, not as an academic question but as a practical proposition, how long can a republican form of government exist under that condition of affairs? It is not guns alone, or ships alone, which constitute the safety and the security of a free government; it is the intellect and the character of the citizenship upon which the government rests. One per cent for laying the basis of character and citizenship and 93 per cent dedicated to the purposes of destruction and death, that is a road to speedy and certain breakdown in republican government.

A few weeks ago we were advised that one of the methods by which we were going to reduce taxes was that of discharging departmental clerks and employees, and it was estimated that we would get rid of at least 20,000 employees. I have no doubt but the able Senator who made that prediction, the Senator from Utah, who has been a consistent and persistent advocate of economy, felt entirely certain as to his figures. Mr. President, suppose we had discharged 20,000 employees, it would not have amounted to the appropriation in this bill for one battleship. It would have been a mere bagatelle compared with the \$4,500,000,000 which we are to expend and the deficit which perhaps will follow. But, now, it appears, Mr. President, what those of us who have been here for years anticipated, that after a careful survey of the situation we can not cut out the employees to the amount of 20,000. We shall do well if we cut out to the number of 5,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to remind the Senator, at the same time, that in connection with the effort to reduce the civil employees 20,000—and I am in sympathy with that—there is also in the pending bill an effort to add to the Navy personnel by 20,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the speech of the Senator from Idaho, but I must correct the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio. There is nothing proposed in the bill looking to the increase of the personnel of the Navy at all.

Mr. POMERENE. I have before me the committee report, in which it is stated that the bill as it passed the House made appropriations on a basis of an enlisted strength of 100,000 men in the Navy, and the Senate committee recommends, and has so proposed amendments to the bill, that we shall make appropriations upon the basis of 120,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We have 120,000 men in the Navy now. I have the figures here of the date of May 9, strictly up to date, showing that there are 120,687 men in the Navy. The Senate committee bill does not propose to increase that at all.

Mr. POMERENE. It evidently increases the appropriations on that basis, if I understand the report correctly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It reduces the appropriations.

Mr. BORAH. It increases the appropriations over the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is what misled the Senator from Ohio. The bill as it passed the House proposed to reduce the number. The Senate committee bill is framed on the proposition of maintaining the same number we have now.

Mr. POMERENE. The fact remains none the less that you are increasing the appropriations sufficiently to take care of 20,000 men more than the House provided for.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is an amendment to the House bill; it is not an increase of the appropriations heretofore made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, now let us for a moment take a little broader survey of the debt situation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. Before leaving the question of a reduction in the number of clerks, I think the RECORD ought to state what the facts are a little more fully than what the Senator has demonstrated. The Senator will recall that one of the leading Republicans of the House stated that there would be at least 40,000 clerks separated from the service as soon as the Republicans came into control; and it was stated frequently during the campaign. Recently a survey has been made, and in a Washington paper a few days ago there appeared this statement:

The beginning of the new fiscal year, July 1, will find more than 80,000 employees on the Government's pay rolls in the Capital.

Congress has been unable, despite all efforts at economy, to reduce the executive establishments to anything approximating their prewar size. Before the war there were 27,000 Federal employees in the District of Columbia.

Just one other statement, if the Senator will pardon me:

A similar situation obtains throughout the country. The number of Government workers outside the Capital exceeds 550,000. This is 150,000 more than in normal prewar years, and brings the total of all workers to about 636,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is often stated, in answer to those who would like to curtail naval expenditures and Army expenditures, that the distressed condition of the world, the discontented condition of the world, the unrest throughout the world, will not permit of it at this time. The discontent and disorder which prevail throughout the world at this time are due very largely to the great debt which has been and is being imposed upon the people by reason of these Army and Navy expenditures throughout the world.

Almost equal to the crime of those who were guilty of the bringing on of the war was the crime which the allied and associated powers committed, when, after the signing of the armistice, they each and all began to arm against one another—for there was no one else against whom to arm—upon a more stupendous scale than had ever before characterized the nations of the world.

Let me call your attention to the fact that in 1920, two years after the war had closed, when the German Navy had been destroyed and her army reduced to 200,000, the allied and associated powers, the five great nations, expended for their armies and their navies \$16,442,251,101.

Those powers which were victors together impose upon their people the burden in one year of over \$16,000,000,000 for armament, for armies and navies, and against whom? That is the source of the discontent. That is the source of the disorder. The promise that this war was to end war has resulted in a preparation for the next war upon a scale which the human mind never before conceived.

Now, I ask again of my friends, how are you going to stop it except through an agreement, except through a conference? How are you going to lift the burden which is now creating unrest and dissatisfaction not only throughout Europe, but throughout this country, except by an agreement among the powers which are laying on the debt?

Look at the condition in France to-day. France has an army of 800,000 men. She has her military alliances with some seven or eight of the European powers. She is extending a network of militaristic power throughout Europe, and yet the condition of the French citizen to-day is one of abject poverty. How shall we assist in aiding France to get from under that situation? Shall we do it by building battleships, by increasing our Army and our Navy, or shall we bring about an agreement by which the great naval powers of the world may disarm the ocean and at least initiate a program of peace which will bring poise and contentment to the other nations of the world?

Mr. President, I do not wish to digress to the subject of disarmament. I simply desired at this time to call attention to some of these increases and the general subject of expenditures. I think I shall content myself with that phase of the subject at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I find it will be impossible for me to be in the Senate this afternoon on account of a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs, and perhaps out of order in the sense of the Senate not yet having



reached the portion of the bill to which I refer, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill for some information concerning section 4, which commences at the bottom of page 53, and has to do with the value placed upon the ration in the Navy when commuted and paid in cash to officers and enlisted men. The first part of the section reads:

That during the fiscal year 1922 the ration for officers and enlisted men of the Navy entitled thereto shall be commuted at the rate of 60 cents per diem.

The Army ration when commuted to officers and enlisted men is 53 cents per diem, and I am wondering why the Navy ration when commuted in this way should be 7 cents higher than that paid in the Army.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the difference in the amount allowed for commutation of rations in the Army and Navy is probably due in a very large measure to the different circumstances under which Army and Navy officers are situated when they receive commutation for rations. The naval service in very large measure when commutation of rations is allowed is in foreign port, and under a much greater variety of conditions in the main than those which surround Army officers who receive commutation of rations.

It is due also in part, no doubt, to the difference which is created by law in the contents of the Navy ration and the Army ration. Of course, I realize that that does not apply to rations which are bought officers who receive commutation of rations, but I have no doubt it had weight with Congress in the enactment of the law. This thing is fixed by the law, which provides 68 cents as the amount allowed for commutation of rations in the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator mean 68 cents?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. The committee propose to reduce it in the pending bill from 68 cents, which is fixed by existing law, to 60 cents, a reduction of 8 cents. I may read the statute which specifies the contents of the Navy ration, bearing in mind all the time that it is not this ration which those who receive commutation of rations are supplied with, but suggesting that the law having fixed the contents of the Navy ration, the cost of that ration fixed by law perhaps had something to do with the amount allowed in commutation of rations to the Navy. The act of June 29, 1906, amending section 1580 of the Revised Statutes, provides that—

The Navy ration shall consist of the following daily allowance of provisions to each person: One pound and a quarter of salt or smoked meat, with 3 ounces of dried or 6 ounces of canned or preserved fruit, and 3 gills of beans or peas, or 12 ounces of flour; or 1 pound of preserved meat, with 3 ounces of dried or 6 ounces of canned or preserved fruit and 8 ounces of rice or 12 ounces of canned vegetables, or 6 ounces of desiccated vegetables; together with 1 pound of biscuit, 2 ounces of butter, 4 ounces of sugar, 2 ounces of coffee or cocoa, or one-half ounce of tea and 1 ounce of condensed milk or evaporated cream; and a weekly allowance of one-quarter pound of macaroni, 4 ounces of cheese, 4 ounces of tomatoes, one-half pint of vinegar or sauce, one-quarter pint of pickles, one-quarter pint of molasses, 4 ounces of salt, one-half ounce of pepper, one-eighth ounce of spices, and one-half ounce of dry mustard. Seven pounds of lard, or a suitable substitute, shall be allowed for every hundred pounds of flour issued as bread, and such quantities of yeast and flavoring extracts as may be necessary.

The cost of that ration, and upon which no doubt by analogy the allowance of commutation of rations was made—whether or not it should be based upon such an analogy as a subject which undoubtedly was weighed by previous Congresses, in fixing the amount allowed is a matter of mathematical calculation. The lowest cost, taking the basis of the average price of the ingredients which go into this ration and the wholesale prices paid in New York, which is the most favorable condition under which it can be bought, was 63 cents, and upon a full consideration of the entire matter the committee fixed the amount at 60 cents.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not pretend to an intimate knowledge of the methods of the Navy in procuring the ration. I think it can not be denied, however, that the Navy ration is very little different from the Army ration in its make-up. I do not think it can be contended that the sailors in the Navy are fed upon distinctly better food or more food than the soldiers in the Army, and in listening to the contents of the ration as provided in the law just read by the Senator from Washington it occurred to me that the two rations are very close together; in fact, the two services have often consulted, as I understand it—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment, if I may be permitted. I understand, of course, that it costs a little more for the Navy to handle their ration because they have to handle it under more unusual conditions. I assume that handling the ration on shipboard, the keeping of it on shipboard, is a little more expensive than keeping it on shore as it is kept in an Army supply base. Probably more overhead expense is incurred in that

regard. But the truth of the matter is that the Army ration to-day costs only 42 and a fraction cents, and it is surprising to me that the Navy ration costs 63 cents. I can not believe that there is that actual difference in value.

Now, as to the commutation. The commutation of rations is a part of the pay, in a very true sense, of officers and enlisted men. The Army commutes its rations to the officers and men who are entitled to commutation of rations, in accordance with the actual cost of the ration year by year. This year the commuted ration in the Army is fixed at 53 cents, because that was the average cost of the Army ration last year. This coming year it will go down to something like 43 or 45 cents, and the officer or enlisted man who is on a detail which prevents him from eating at a soldiers' mess or taking advantage of the mess facilities provided in camps and Army posts will only get 43 or 45 cents a day for his ration. In other words, he gets that amount in cash with which he is supposed to buy his food. The Navy man on the same kind of detail will get 60 cents to go out and buy the same kind of food the Army man has to buy.

I can not understand why there is this great difference. Either the Navy is too high or the Army is too low. The Army fluctuates the value of its ration, when commuted to its officers and men, in accordance with the varying cost. The Navy ration is fixed by law, and law is inelastic and can not comply with the changing conditions of the market which govern the actual value or the actual cost of the ration.

Now, it is stated that so much of the Navy personnel is entitled to commutation of rations because they find themselves in foreign ports. I have not made an examination of the figures as to the cost of living in foreign ports as compared with the cost of living in the principal cities of the United States, but I venture the assertion that the cost of living in foreign ports is lower than it is in New York or Chicago or San Francisco, and that the 60 cents paid to the naval officer or the naval enlisted man as a commuted ration will go further in Hongkong or Tokyo than the 53 cents paid to Army men will go in New York or Chicago.

I think the two services should be upon one basis in this regard. I do not know how much money this amounts to in the course of a year, but the commutation of rations I know is a large item in the Army bill, and it has always been somewhat of a mystery to me why the Navy ration is asserted to cost so much more than the Army ration when they are very much alike in their ingredients. It does cost a little more for the Navy to handle their rations because they have to do it under artificial conditions, but why it should cost 50 per cent more passes my understanding. I merely make the suggestion to the Committee on Naval Affairs that they ascertain why the Navy ration, as compared with the Army ration, costs almost 50 per cent more. Sixty-eight cents, as I am informed by the Senator from Washington, is what the ration is supposed to be costing now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is fixed by law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; by law, and, of course, they will spend it, whereas the Army ration costs only 42.99 cents. There is something wrong somewhere.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, of course the ration for the Army and the Navy is a fixed and certain quantity of ingredients.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And they are very much alike.

Mr. SWANSON. No; it is about 20 per cent more in the Navy. The estimate is that the Navy has about 20 per cent stronger ration than the Army. That is, they can make a selection—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator surely does not mean that.

Mr. SWANSON. They have so much coffee, so much sugar, so much vegetables, and various other items.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Senator does not think there is 20 per cent more coffee and 20 per cent more sugar for a sailor than for a soldier?

Mr. SWANSON. There is this difference: In the Army when a soldier is at Fort Myer we are willing he shall take his meals in Washington, because the health conditions in Washington are, on the average, probably as good as those at Fort Myer and at other Army posts; but, in the case of the Navy, if a sailor, for instance, is at Hongkong or at any other foreign port where the health conditions are not known he is discouraged from taking meals outside of the ship; everything possible is done to induce him to come to his mess. If a ship goes to Norfolk or to New York and it is not known whether there is an epidemic at the port where the ship anchors the commanding officers of the ship insist that their men, instead of taking meals in town when they get leave of absence, shall get their meals at the ship mess, because in that way danger of infection is



avoided. If a sailor returning to his ship should bring an infection, such as typhoid fever or other contagious disease because of unfit food, it would nearly destroy the entire efficiency of the ship. The number of those who take their meals off the ship when on leave is reduced as low as possible, because everything is done that can be done for the health of the Navy on account of the peculiar conditions and the close contact of men on shipboard. Any other policy might be disastrous.

Then it is estimated that it takes more food to supply a man engaged in a seafaring life than it does on land, and his ration costs more.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator consider work in the trenches?

Mr. SWANSON. Work in the trenches is not carried on in peace time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the same law in respect to this matter operates in peace and in war.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, when a ship goes to Norfolk or to San Francisco or to Galveston or to Hongkong it is not always possible to contract with the lowest bidder for supplies at each place. Consequently more is paid in the Navy than in the Army. It is impossible for the Navy to buy beef of the great contractors all over the United States, because a ship comes into port and leaves in a short time. Therefore it advertises for so much beef or for so many supplies of other kinds as it may need immediately, and, consequently, it costs a little more in order to supply each unit separately.

In addition to that, as the Senator has suggested, cold storage and other expenses for taking care of provisions and supplies in the Navy are greater than similar expenses in the Army. The estimate is that it generally costs about 20 per cent more on account of the conditions in the Navy than it does in the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the difference in this instance is 50 per cent.

Mr. SWANSON. The cost may be greater than I have indicated. I think the Navy had a larger supply on hand when peace was declared than had the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. SWANSON. I think it had more of the character of supplies used by the men. I think some of the sugar used now was bought long ago. In any event, however, this commutation amounts to very little. No officer receives any commutation; the Navy feeds only the enlisted men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator mean to say that the officers of the Navy do not get commuted rations when they can not avail themselves of any other facilities?

Mr. SWANSON. Officers in the Navy, as I understand, are paid a certain salary and commutation of quarters when the quarters are not furnished; but the ration which we are now discussing is for enlisted men who can not take their meals at the mess. The Navy does not board its officers. The officers of the Navy pay their own board; they have what is called the officers' mess, the expenses of which are paid by private subscription amongst the officers. I will ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] if that is not true?

Mr. NEWBERRY. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. Of course the commutation does not amount to over a few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWBERRY. An officer in the Navy is not allowed commuted rations at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then why mention officers in the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know why they are mentioned. It may be that warrant officers receive commutation, but no commissioned officer receives it. The provision may have reference to warrant and petty officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, let us talk about enlisted men.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well, this provision applies to enlisted men. If, for instance, an enlisted man when his ship reaches Norfolk is ordered to carry a message to Washington and is detailed for that purpose, he can not be at his mess, and accordingly the Government pays his expenses when he is away from the ship. He is given 60 or 63 cents a day to pay his board. I am inclined to think that it costs the man who is detailed more than the allowance given; but the item does not affect any large number of men. It simply affects the enlisted man who can not take his meals at his mess.

In order to fix the commutation a sample is taken and an estimate is arrived at as to what it is going to cost the next year, and that is covered in the appropriation. If the amount expended for this purpose is greater than the appropriation, the increase, whatever it may be, has to be taken care of by a deficiency. The enlisted man is entitled to get the specific things provided.

I do not believe any of the men who are detailed to duty away from their ships receive a commutation that is equal to what it costs them to live off the ship. I believe it costs them more than the commutation allowance.

Why is the commutation fixed? It is fixed for the reason that the enlisted man is entitled to it under certain circumstances when he is detailed away from his mess, but unless Congress fixes a specific amount the Comptroller of the Treasury will not pass the claim when it is filed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not fixed in the Army by law.

Mr. SWANSON. The Army fixes the commutation at the rate of 42 cents, I understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The commutation rate in the Army is fixed by the Quartermaster General with the approval of the Secretary of War, and Congress has no part in it.

Mr. SWANSON. In the case of the Navy it is generally fixed in the statute according to the cost of the ration the year before.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If I may interrupt the Senator, there is the unfairness of treatment of the two services. The Senator recited the case of a sailor who was sent to carry a message, for instance, from Norfolk to Washington. On his way to Washington or on his way back, of course, he can not avail himself of the sailors' mess, and he gets his rations commuted for the time he is detailed to serve away from his mess.

Mr. SWANSON. That is 60 cents under this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A soldier from Fort Myer may be sent to carry a message down to Norfolk, and he gets 53 cents. Why should that be? Next year the soldier will get about 43 cents, while the sailor will still get 60 cents. There is no justice in that. Either the commutation in the Navy is too high or that in the Army is too low.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, like so many other apparently insoluble problems, I think this one can be very easily solved by pointing out an error in the premise upon which the whole argument is based. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] asked the same question that any man not especially familiar with naval affairs might ask, as to why there was a difference in the cost of the Navy ration and the Army ration; and the Senator suggests as the basis of his criticism of this difference that the two rations are the same.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not quite, but very nearly the same.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And, of course, that assumption being erroneous, any subsequent conclusion based upon it is also erroneous. The two rations are not the same. We made a most careful inquiry into that matter, and it is certainly a matter about which there could be no doubt when the records of the services are inquired into. The naval ration is fixed by law. I read the law a moment ago—that is, the statute of the United States—and the naval ration is 50 per cent greater in quantity, by weight, than is the ration allowed the Army. The lowest figure of the cost of the Army ration as given here by the Senator from New York is 42 cents. If the Navy ration is 50 per cent greater than the Army ration, adding that 50 per cent to the cost of the Army ration would make, for the difference in quantity, 63 cents as the cost of the Navy ration, based upon the expenses which each is incurring in proportion to rations as they are now. The Naval Committee fixed the cost of the ration at 3 cents lower than that, or 60 cents.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator where he gets the information that the Navy ration is 50 per cent heavier than the Army ration?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I get it from the examination which was made at the request of the committee by the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy Department, and his subsequently carefully prepared statement before the Naval Affairs Committee. I will give the Senator from New York some of the details.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment. Then, I understand from that, that 50 per cent more food in weight is issued to sailors than is issued to soldiers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is true. There is a much greater variety.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. The Army ration is—

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, a certain kind of food must be furnished in the Navy which it is not essential to provide for the Army. Take the matter of green vegetables and fruits. There is a certain quantity of those which are absolutely necessary for the use of the Navy. Unless the Navy may have a certain amount of vegetables and also fruits, such as oranges and lemons, which furnish a preventive of scurvy, it is a very serious matter. The rations in the two services are bound to be different. The ration for the Navy is fixed by the Medical Department of the Navy. If a thousand



men in the Navy should become sick from an improper ration, it would involve a serious loss. So the Medical Department determines the elements of the ration, and the result has been beneficial to the Navy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the "comparison of quantities of ration components allowed per man daily for the two services" in some of the principal items are as follows: The Army daily allowance of beef is 20 ounces, while in the Navy the daily allowance of beef is 28 ounces. The Army daily allowance of bacon, in case bacon is substituted for beef, is 12 ounces, while it is 20 ounces for the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does that apply to the Marine Corps?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; the Marine Corps ration is based upon the Army ration. This applies only to the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the Marine Corps ration different?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is similar to that of the Army.

The amount of rice allowed in the daily ration in the Navy is 16 ounces, while in the Army it is 8 ounces. Of potatoes the allowance is 20 ounces in the Army and 28 ounces in the Navy. The allowance of beans for the Army is 2.4 ounces and 12 ounces for the Navy. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a complete tabulated statement on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

*Army garrison ration versus Navy ration.*

[Comparison of quantities of ration components allowed per man daily for the two services and the cost thereof. "Unit of cost" prices were obtained from the Navy supply depot, New York, and are those in effect May 1, 1921.]

	Army daily allow- ance.	Navy daily allow- ance.	Unit of cost.	Cost to Navy.	Cost to Army.
<b>Meat:</b>	<b>Ounces.</b>	<b>Ounces.</b>	<b>Pounds.</b>		
Beef or mutton, fresh.....	20	28	\$0.1756	\$0.3073	\$0.2195
Or bacon.....	12	20	.2485	.3105	.1863
Or meats, tinned.....	16	16	.2001	.2001	.2001
Or turkey, fowl, etc.....	16	28	.3932	.6881	.3932
Or eggs.....		( <sup>1</sup> )	.262	.1612	
<b>Bread:</b>					
Bread, fresh.....	18	20	.0711	.0888	.0799
Or flour.....	18	18	.0425	.0478	.0478
<b>Vegetables:</b>					
Rice, hominy, etc.....	1.6	8	.065	.0325	.0064
Or potatoes.....	20	28	.0181	.03167	.02262
Or beans, dried.....	2.4	12	.061	.04575	.00912
<b>Fruits:</b>					
Fruit, fresh.....		9	.0857	.0482	
Or fruits, dried.....	1.28	3	.2156	.04041	.01724
Or jams.....	1.28	6	.178	.0666	.0142
<b>Beverages:</b>					
Coffee, ground.....	1.12	2	.131	.01636	.0092
Or tea.....	.32	1	.1817	.00567	.00317
Sugar.....	3.2	4	.067	.01675	.0131
Milk, evaporated.....	.5	1	.0075	.0061	.00305
Butter.....	.5	2	2.385	.048	.012
<b>Average cost.</b>					
				Navy.	Army.
Meats.....				\$0.3334	\$0.2497
Bread.....				.0683	.0638
Vegetables.....				.0366	.0127
Fruit.....				.0517	.0157
Beverages.....				.0110	.0062
Sugar, milk, butter.....				.0708	.0281
Total.....				.5718	.3782
Army.....				.3782	
Difference (52 per cent).....				.1936	

<sup>1</sup> Two-thirds dozen.

<sup>2</sup> This is market quotation. N. S. D. still issuing stock of tinned butter at 60 cents.

Comparisons of contract prices, dried provisions, New York, fiscal year 1920, with those in effect May 1, 1921.

	Unit.	1920, average for 1 year.	1921, as of May 1.
Apples, dried.....	Pound.....	\$0.1499	\$0.1499
Apricots, tinned.....	do.....	.1276	.1185
Bacon, tinned.....	do.....		.2485
Beans, dried.....	do.....	.0588	.061
Lima, tinned.....	do.....	.0675	.0675
String, tinned.....	do.....	.11	.1048
Biscuit.....	do.....	.165	.075
Butter.....	do.....	.58	.385
Cocoa.....	do.....		.09
Coffee, green.....	do.....	.1324	.0867
Corn, tinned.....	do.....	.0917	.078

Comparisons of contract prices, dried provisions, New York, etc.—Contd.

	Unit.	1920, average for 1 year.	1921, as of May 1.
Extract, lemon.....	4-ounce bottle.....		\$0.35
Flour, wheat.....	pound.....	\$0.05	.0425
Ham, smoked.....	do.....	.4223	.260
Macaroni.....	do.....	.1272	.1375
Milk, evaporated.....	do.....	.1326	.0975
Mustard.....	do.....		.324
Peaches, dried.....	do.....	.21	.218
Peaches, tinned.....	do.....	.171	.165
Pears, tinned.....	do.....	.1895	.175
Peas, tinned.....	do.....	.1343	.094
Pepper.....	do.....		.263
Pickles.....	do.....	.0511	.08
Prunes, tinned.....	do.....	.1021	.102
Raisins.....	do.....	.26	.279
Rice.....	do.....	.115	.065
Salmon, tinned.....	do.....	.2538	.283
Salt.....	do.....	.0097	.01
Sirup.....	Gallon.....	.578	.67
Sugar.....	Pound.....	.1871	.067
Tea.....	do.....	.2093	.1817
Tomatoes, tinned.....	do.....	.0632	.052
Vinegar.....	Gallon.....	.38	.343

Comparative statement of prices of fresh provisions as per contracts placed at the port of New York.

Items.	Oct. 1, 1920.	May 1, 1921.
Potatoes:		
Irish.....	\$0.0313	\$0.0145
Sweet.....	.0279	.051
Onions, main crop.....	.0307	.0241
Cabbage, early or late.....	.015	.0278
Bananas.....	.0823	.0798
Oranges.....	.0823	.0178
Apples.....	.0423	.0493
Lemons.....	.0498	.0467
Fresh beef, in quarters.....	.2028	.1627
Fresh veal, in sides.....	.1847	.175
Fresh mutton, in carcasses.....	.172	.1483
Fresh beef, frozen, in quarters.....	.2078	.1632
Fresh veal in sides, frozen.....	.1923	.165
Fresh mutton, frozen, in carcasses.....	.172	.1533
Fresh chicken, dressed and drawn, in commercial crates.....	.5649	.3238
Chicken, fresh, frozen, in commercial crates.....	.4024	.3198
Frankfurter sausages, in 25-pound boxes.....	.2173	.1487
Bologna sausages, in 25-pound boxes.....	.1773	.1247
Sugar-cured hams, in 100-pound boxes.....	.379	.2485
Sugar-cured bacon, in 100-pound boxes.....	.35325	.1942
Fresh beef liver, in 50-pound boxes.....	.1393	.1015
Luncheon meat, in 25-pound boxes.....	.2262	.1472
Bread:		
Wheat.....	.08	.0572
Graham.....	.08	.0572
Rolls.....	.20	.085
Butter.....	.6262	1.385
Cheese, full cream.....	.2989	.2033
Eggs, dozen.....	.567	.2032
Milk, fresh, gallons.....	.64	.285

<sup>1</sup> Current market price; additional price for packing and delivery, \$0.111.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the particular increase reported by the committee in the item of this bill which is now pending before the Senate, while it amounts to several million dollars, is of itself not of great importance, and were that the only item of increase in the bill I should not intrude myself upon the Senate. However, it is only one of a great many increases which, to my mind, need the careful consideration of the Senate. In my judgment most of them ought not to be made.

Mr. President, I have a few remarks to offer upon the subject of economy—a very unpopular subject in the Senate—and I make a special request that while I am speaking about economy the Presiding Officer and the reporter shall remain in the Chamber. I am not particular about others. I know that what I shall say about economy will not meet with a favorable response from the Senate, but probably will merely subject me to ridicule and criticism.

If a man goes in debt for the purpose of doing some useful thing, creating some new product, developing some new invention of use and benefit to mankind, he can afford to take considerable risk; and even when he is in debt it is sometimes good business to go further in debt for the purpose of increasing the production of manufactured articles for consumption. But when a man borrows money to be destroyed, thrown away, he is entering upon a very doubtful enterprise, and he can justify himself only by demonstrating that borrowing the money or going in debt is a necessity. I am not quarreling with my friends who believe in a big Navy. The Secretary of the Navy is in favor of providing for the largest Navy in the world, and so was his predecessor; so I suppose it is an administration feature. I am aware of the arguments that can be made in

favor of such a course, and while I do not agree with them and would not agree with them under ordinary circumstances, it seems to me under existing conditions that no man, in justice to the people and the country, can stand for that kind of a program. No matter how badly we may think we ought to build more battleships and increase armament, no matter how necessary under ordinary conditions we might believe it to be, we are confronted now with the danger of bankruptcy.

The ordinary business man may want something now; but even though it be useful, if he is not financially situated so that he can afford it he will get along without it. He will have to. The ordinary person, if he bought everything that he wanted now, would be a bankrupt to-morrow. It is the same way with a government. We are confronted with a condition in the world and in the United States where bankruptcy is staring civilization in the face. For every dollar that we appropriate here, somebody must toil, somebody must work. It must be produced by labor. There is no escape from it.

We are now in debt away beyond the power of the imagination to conceive. We are now called upon to pay more interest on the debt that we owe than it cost to run the Government before the war.

In addition to that we have necessary expenses now that we must provide for that did not exist before the war, and for which we must tax in order to pay, so that the expenses of our Government necessarily must be much greater.

We can not at once get rid of the war machinery. We must come down gradually. We must pay the soldiers. We must continue to pay them during their lives, and their widows after they are gone. Some of these things are necessary in fairness to those who fought our battles. We must be just to them, even though the burden is great. But, Mr. President, if in addition to doing those necessary things we are going into the extravagance of undertaking to build the greatest Navy in the world, and maintain in time of peace an Army all out of proportion to any that we ever maintained in time of peace before, we are then calling upon the taxpayers of the country to perform an impossibility, and when we reach that time we all know what the result must be. When we go so far with our taxation that it is impossible for money to be produced, then failure—bankruptcy—stares us in the face.

We are confronted now with a condition in the country where a great proportion of our people are suffering even for the necessities of life; and, Mr. President, they will not justify, in my humble opinion, the expenditure that Congress is making in the particular bill that we have before us now. For the sake of argument, even concede that we would like to do it; even concede that we ought to do it; it is unwise to attempt to do it, because it is overburdening the people of the United States, the men and the women who have to toil to produce the money that we spend.

Mr. President, it is easy to say, amid the plaudits of the people, that we want to build up the greatest Navy in the world, that we want to carry our flag on battleships into every port in civilization. That would be nice; I confess I should like to do it myself; but, Mr. President, we can not do it. It is an impossibility. We are going on now at such a rate that unless we stop we shall face ruin; and when the people of the country, realizing that, bowed down with toil, suffering from hunger and shivering with cold, are once aroused they will repudiate what we are doing now and they will repudiate us.

Many of our people are not making both ends meet right now. Outside of the pledges that we made for economy, outside of the promises we made that we would reduce appropriations, even though they were never made, we are confronted now with a condition that absolutely demands that even though under ordinary circumstances these things would be considered by us as necessary, we must not have them now; and when the people realize that instead of reducing taxation we have increased the burdens of taxation they will repudiate us, and they ought to. We shall have to do that, even though we do not increase appropriations, Mr. President; even though we raise no more money than we have been raising. The burden of taxation must be increased, because some avenues of revenue are closed now and others are rapidly closing.

Men who paid income taxes in the year that has just passed will escape paying them now, some because they have no income, and some because they have invented ways of avoiding the law, such, for instance, as stock dividends, and so forth, the result being that the ordinary person pays a larger and a heavier tax, and Congress is hunting now for something to tax. We are looking around in desperation to find something on which we can levy a tax, and we all know that we shall have to increase the tax on many of the necessities of life.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not the tendency of the present tax legislation to drive people out of business and to discourage people from going into business?

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is; and right there, Mr. President, to show the condition of the people, where they are met, even after they have produced in abundance, with the fact that they can get nothing for what they produce, although in other localities people need the very thing that they produce, let me read a portion of a letter.

I was reminded of this by an interruption of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], when he referred to the other burdens outside of taxation that have been increased, and he referred particularly to freight rates; and, Mr. President, it was a very apt illustration, in my judgment. It makes very little difference whether we carry freight for nothing and pay for it out of the Treasury, or whether we charge for it as we do now; its cost is distributed over all of the people. Every man, woman, and child pays something on everything they eat, everything they use, and everything they wear, for freight rates, for transportation costs. They enter into everything around us and about us; so they constitute one form of taxation that we must all pay, even though we never see an engine or ride on a car.

This man writes me from Holt County, Nebr. As he says in the letter, that is one of the greatest hay-producing sections in the entire world. I think it is probably the greatest hay-producing section in the United States, at least. It produces hay in abundance. It is baled and shipped to market. Most of the land along the valley produces hay. It is the great industry of that particular locality, and it is shipped all over the United States.

This writer says, in part of the letter:

I had 300 carloads of hay on my ranch which I expected to bale, haul, and ship, and could have done so under the old 1918 rates.

He has just said, in the prior part of the letter, that the freight rates on hay had been increased 100 per cent.

I \* \* \* could have done so under the old 1918 rates, giving employment to men, and used a part of the 457,000 idle freight cars, and would have paid the railroad \$6,000 for hauling the hay to Omaha.

But, as he has said, the freight rate now amounts to \$12,000, which is more than he can get for the hay; and so he goes on and says:

But I could not pay \$12,000, the amount of the new rate; consequently, I had to let the hay rot in the stack. Now, this condition is a bad condition, and what is true with me is true with hundreds of others, and they will be ruined and put out of business, as they have no other business to depend upon.

Mr. President, that is not an exception to the rule; that is the general rule. That obtains all over the United States, in one industry or another. It is a form of taxation which the people of the country are called upon to pay beyond their ability to pay. It can not be done; it is an impossibility.

Mr. President, I could fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with letters. I have a letter here from a banker, who owns a farm near the town where he is doing business, and he went out there on Sunday and skinned a steer which had died the day before, together with the help of a man on the farm, and they hauled the hide to town, and the banker was not able to get enough for the hide to pay the man who helped him skin the steer.

He wrote here about his bank, located in a farming community, in a small village, where farmers, like this man, who had stock, who had hay, who had corn, were not able to dispose of it because they could not get out of it enough to pay for the harvesting of it or the hauling of it, as the case might be, but let it rot; so that a large amount of freight which would otherwise, under ordinary circumstances, come to the railroad, did not reach the railroad. It was a loss, not only a total loss to the man who produced it, but a loss to the railroad, and at the other end a loss to the consumer, who had to pay a higher price for the product, whatever it might be, because of the lessening of competition.

This banker said in his letter:

These farmers owe the banks on paper, which, under ordinary circumstances, would be the best in the world. My bank is the same as every other country bank. If we undertook to close out the men who owed, and put upon the market for sale, under the hammer, the products that are mortgaged to us, there would be nobody to buy. A horse worth \$150 would not bring \$10, and if the bankers bought all the products that they had they would go out of the banking business that day, because they would bankrupt themselves in trying to care for it and feed it, and would have no way to dispose of it.

Mr. President, that is the condition of the country now, and here we are called upon to pass an appropriation bill carrying amounts far beyond anything ever heard of in time of peace for the support of the Navy.



Again, let me say, I am not quarreling with the man who wants a big Navy. For the purpose of the argument, I am admitting you are right, although, as I said before, I do not believe you are. But let us admit you are right. You are confronted now with a condition in which, if you take into consideration the welfare of the people who compose this country, you must halt and wait. Mr. President, we can not afford to spend the money that is appropriated in this bill.

Outside of all that, Mr. President, I do not think there is any great demand for it. The menace of the German navy has disappeared. Our Navy, as it stands now, is larger than any navy in the world except that of one country, and even in a war with that nation, taking into consideration our coasts and her coasts, we would have in proportion a larger navy than she has.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I ask the Senator whether he saw a statement two or three days ago in the papers to the effect that Great Britain was going to increase her navy by building four superdreadnoughts, or, rather, super-superdreadnoughts, greater than any vessels afloat now?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I saw that.

Mr. STERLING. I think they are to have a displacement of something over 50,000 tons.

Mr. NORRIS. I saw that statement in the newspapers, and I saw just a short time ago, I think in the Scientific American, a rather scientific analysis of what Great Britain was doing, in which it was shown that Great Britain was doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator please refer to the number of the Scientific American in which that statement appears? I get the Scientific American and I would like to refer to it.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not do it offhand; I have not got it here. But there were two articles in the Scientific American some time ago, before the naval appropriation bill was up in the last session. I had it then in my desk, and intended to use it, but on account of illness I was unable to speak on the bill.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, it has been admitted by a member of the British Admiralty on the floor of Parliament that Great Britain is constructing the superdreadnoughts referred to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course I can not deny it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me just a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator said that the denial which he saw, as I understood him, was dated—

Mr. NORRIS. It was not a denial; it was a review of Great Britain's naval policy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was before the adjournment of the last session of Congress?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The information I have is that this program has been adopted since that time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, that only furnishes another reason why we ought to call a halt. The size of the Navy is a relative proposition. In building the Navy we must take into consideration the navies of the other nations of the world, and they must do the same thing. After there passed through the House and was pending in the Senate at the last session a bill providing for this wonderful increase in the building of battleships, and of expenditures for the Navy, after the Secretary of the Navy of the new administration had declared for the largest Navy of the world, it was logical that other nations would take notice of it and increase their naval program, and that is just what Great Britain has done.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It ought to be borne in mind, however, that no naval appropriation bill was passed at the last session; that opposition developed to it in the Senate, and that by occupying the time Senators prevented the passage of the bill; but that the Senate did at that time adopt an amendment to the bill declaring in favor of the Nation negotiating for a limitation of armaments.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and it will probably do that again. The bill did not become a law. It passed the House; it was reported from the Senate committee; and it would have passed the Senate, as everybody knew, and as Great Britain knew, had adjournment not prevented it. Then it was followed by the Secretary of the Navy announcing that we wanted the largest

Navy in the world, and is it to be wondered at, Mr. President, that other nations should take heed of that course?

We start out on a program here to build the biggest Navy in the world. It will take several years to complete it. But we forget that there are other nations in this race besides us. We can not carry that out without other nations in our class performing the same kind of trick.

We build a battleship bigger than any that floats. Some other nation takes notice of it and starts out to build a bigger one. The third nation sees what is being done and goes one better and builds a still bigger one. So on around the circle, and when you get around to the place of beginning the first battleship is out of date, fit only for target practice, it is scrapped, and all the money put into it is gone. So this race goes on around a circle. We increase in this bill our Navy program. It means that other nations, whether they want to or not, must increase theirs, and they will.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is stating now what actually occurred, according to the contention of naval men of England, to wit, that Great Britain had not laid down a capital ship since the war.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. Since the armistice, and that she was not proposing to do so. I am only stating their contention, which I have here on my desk. After it was announced, first by Mr. Daniels, that we would have the largest Navy in the world, then followed by the announcement of Secretary Denby, the demand in Great Britain for building an increased navy was such that the Government was willing to go further, and they have put out those four super-Hood dreadnoughts.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, nothing new occurred in the United States to cause Great Britain to make any such increase in her naval appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; something new did occur. The Republican administration came into power and announced, through its Secretary of the Navy, that it proposed to have the greatest Navy in the world, and that was at the beginning of the new administration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was not proposed by the Republican administration to add to the program which had already been adopted and which was already in process of construction, and had been for several years, having been adopted in 1916.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely so; but the information was given out that the program was to be completed; that the United States was to take the mastery of the sea and to have a Navy which would dominate the sea. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to read a paragraph in this magazine?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I read from an article by Mr. Hurd, who is recognized the world over as an authority on naval affairs, in the April number of the 1921 Fortnightly Review. I will not read all of it, but a paragraph. The article states:

The naval situation is a simple one. The fleets of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia have, to all intents and purposes, disappeared; the navies of France and Italy have become obsolescent, owing to the long interval which has elapsed since they were reinforced by new vessels; only three naval powers can now be regarded as first class. They are Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. The strength of these three navies in capital ships to-day and three years hence is revealed in the following statement:

	1921	1924
United States:		
Ships.....	17	33
Displacement, tons.....	467,250	1,117,350
Guns.....	183	340
Foot-tons energy.....	11,989,176	28,597,176
Great Britain:		
Ships.....	32	32
Displacement, tons.....	808,200	808,200
Guns.....	284	284
Foot-tons energy.....	19,080,000	19,080,000
Japan:		
Ships.....	11	17
Displacement, tons.....	319,140	543,140
Guns.....	108	164
Foot-tons energy.....	7,480,000	13,415,400

That was the program as it was outlined, as it was determined upon by Great Britain prior to the incoming of the Republican administration. After the incoming of the Republican administration, when it was announced that this program was to be completed, that the United States proposed to have the greatest Navy in the world; the demand of the naval authorities of Great Britain was supported by the people of Great



Britain and they began their building program. That ends the proposition which they have been telling us heretofore that in 1924 we will have a greater Navy than Great Britain, because Great Britain does not propose to stop building except upon the theory that we limit our building; and so, relatively speaking, as the Senator very well said, we will have no greater Navy in 1924 than we have now.

Mr. NORRIS. But we shall be a great deal nearer bankruptcy.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. Let me read this further paragraph:

On the eve of Mr. Harding assuming the office of President the American Congress adopted a resolution in favor of a conference being called between the American, British, and Japanese Governments to consider a reduction in the plans for naval construction for a period of five years. That resolution is in line with the policy enunciated by the first Lord of the admiralty 12 months ago. It offers the promise of a full, frank, and friendly discussion, which may lift from the peoples of the world the fear that they are about to be drawn into a new phase of naval rivalry which must involve them in standards of expenditure which they can not afford.

If the new American Government will make use of the channels at its disposal for obtaining accurate information, it will discover that this country has already given a lead in the direction of the limitation of naval armaments, and that the British dominions have kept step with it. No ship, large or small, whether for the British fleet, a dominion force, or a foreign fleet, has been laid down in this country for a matter of nearly five years—

Mr. NORRIS. To what country does he refer?

Mr. BORAH. Great Britain—

since, in short, the American shipbuilding program was adopted—and, so far as France and Italy are concerned, those countries have spent practically nothing on new ships for a period of seven years.

By the time the present American program, with its 152 guns of 16-inch caliber, is completed the British Navy will comprise only 14 battleships which will then be regarded as first class, together with 4 battle cruisers.

That was the condition of affairs up until the inspiration to start rebuilding under the new administration.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it disfigure the Senator's speech if at this point I should call his attention to the report made by the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the number of vessels we have?

Mr. NORRIS. No, indeed. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. KING. In the report of December 1, 1920, it is stated that there were in the Naval Establishment of the United States, fit for service on that date, 795 vessels of the following description:

Battleships	37
Armored cruisers	8
Monitors	6
Cruisers	24
Destroyers	249
Submarines	98
Gunboats	19
Patrol boats	55
Converted yachts	10
Submarine chasers	112
Tugs and mine sweepers	86
Fuel ships	22
Other auxiliaries	46
Vessels unserviceable for war	23

The Secretary also reported as under construction 165 vessels of various types, which upon their completion would bring the total number of vessels of all descriptions in the Navy up to 960, with an aggregate tonnage of 2,910,316 and an aggregate horsepower of 12,865,897.

Let me say, if I may further intrude upon the Senator, that I have here a comparative statement from Sir James Craig, who recently introduced in the British Parliament the new program—which was necessitated, undoubtedly, as the Senator from Idaho has just suggested, by the prodigious naval program which we are executing—and he shows in that comparative statement the absurdity of the contention made by navalists of the United States about our fleet being inferior to the fleets of other nations. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is nothing mysterious about this increase of armament; there is no unnatural law operating. It is perfectly logical. One nation looks to the other nation when it considers how much of an increase it is going to make in its armament. When we start out on a mad race to surpass the world, we must not forget that we can not run that race alone. When we start out with a program that in a certain number of years will put us at the head, we will find before that time is reached that we will have to double and redouble and treble our program in order to keep the lead, if we get it. Every other nation is going to do the same thing. Great Britain decided after the armistice to let up, but decided to start off again after she found out what America was going to

do, and we are going to have cited in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives the fact that Great Britain is building these great big super-super-superdreadnoughts in order to have us build some a little larger.

That is going to be the argument used, and so it will go around the circle. It is endless, and we are as a matter of fact in a race for the bankruptcy of civilization. That is the thing that will come if men do not come to their reason before. Bankruptcy stares every nation in the face that engages in that race. While they look upon Italy and France as having been distanced in the contest, the flag has fallen in their face before they reached the quarter pole. When the race is ended and we are bowed down to earth with debt and burdened with taxation, those nations that quit in the race early will be the only nations in the world standing upon their feet and doing business.

We can not engage in this mad race without ruin. It means ruin, and I protest in the name of the people who have to pay the taxes at this exorbitant expense that we are shouldering upon the backs of our people. We are too apt to consider that our resources are inexhaustible. We are too apt to forget that nature's law applies to our Nation—to Uncle Sam—the same as it does to everybody else and to the other nations. We can not go on expending money beyond the sources of our income without suffering the penalty. When a nation meets bankruptcy it is worse than an individual. When a nation goes through the court of bankruptcy every step that it takes is moistened with the blood of innocent human beings. Revolutions follow. Bolshevism follows. Always without exception bolsheviks hold their sway where revolution takes place, and we can, by overtaxing the people of the world and the people of the country more quickly than by any other means known to man, drive this world into bolshevism and destruction, into bankruptcy, into rebellion, into revolution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Harris	McLean	Shortridge
Broussard	Harrison	McNary	Smith
Bursum	Heflin	Moses	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Myers	Spencer
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Stanfield
Caraway	Kellogg	Nicholson	Stanley
Cummins	Kendrick	Norbeck	Sterling
Curtis	Kenyon	Norris	Sutherland
Dial	King	Oddie	Swanson
Dillingham	Ladd	Overman	Townsend
Ernst	La Follette	Pittman	Trammell
Fletcher	Lodge	Polindexter	Walsh, Mass.
France	McCormick	Pomerene	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Ransdell	Willis
Gooding	McKellar	Robinson	Wolcott
Hale	McKinley	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was speaking a moment ago I called his attention to a recent comparative statement presented to the British Parliament by Sir James Craig showing the naval estimates for the year 1921-22. I have before me the parliamentary debates in the House of Commons for Thursday, the 17th of March, 1921, growing out of these estimates. Speaking to the subject before the Parliament, Lieut. Col. Archer-Shee directed attention, inferentially at least, to the determination of the United States to carry into execution a program that called for the construction of a large number of powerful battleships and battle cruisers. He desired to direct the attention of the house to the new policy of the United States, and therefore offered this suggestion:

In the opinion of this house, owing to the great increase in naval strength of other powers, it is necessary that immediate steps be taken to further increase the strength of the Royal Navy in capital ships, and their ancillary vessels, in order to insure that the British Navy be at least equal in strength to that of any other single power.

I call the attention of the Senate to what I stated yesterday, and what has been referred to in the discussion to-day by the Senator from Idaho, that for five years or more Great Britain has not "laid down" a capital ship. When the armistice was signed Great Britain had upon the stocks three Hood cruisers of the most powerful type afloat, upon which she had expended more than \$16,000,000. These mighty embryonic ships were broken to pieces and the amount expended toward their completion was completely lost. As I am advised, Great Britain was waiting to learn what other naval powers would do, and what steps would be taken to secure disarmament. She formulated no program calling for capital ships, and sought to secure an agreement looking to naval reduction. She and other nations appreciated the importance of the question of world disarmament or a



reduction of the naval and military armament; but the United States declined to approve the league which provided a rational and workable system for disarmament, and, driven by a navalistic and militaristic spirit unworthy of this Republic and in the face of the experiences of the World War and the aspirations of the American people and their desire for world peace, there will be forced through Congress a program that involves the expenditure of more than \$1,000,000,000 in the construction and completion of capital ships and necessary auxiliaries. The attitude of the United States has resulted in Japan and Great Britain reconsidering their determination and their programs. We find evidence of that fact so far as Great Britain is concerned in the resolution offered by the speaker to whom I have just referred in the debate on the 17th of March of this year.

Lieut. Col. Archer-Shee further states:

It is a momentous fact that this nation has to take into consideration that by 1925 this great Nation overseas—

Speaking of the United States—

will have built a fleet which will practically make obsolete all of the battleships of our fleet at the present day, with the exception of one, the *Hood*, of over 41,000 tons, a battle cruiser.

In other words, while Great Britain was willing to suspend the construction of battleships—and that was her policy—our Nation has announced its purpose to drive through a program that calls for several billion dollars for naval expenditures by 1925, and when the ships are completed most of them will be obsolete, if Great Britain completes the naval program suggested, because of our belligerent naval policy. The speaker proceeds:

To meet that situation the Government proposes to lay down four ships only this year, and that means that these four ships, as the parliamentary secretary has said, can not be commenced until next year.

In my remarks yesterday, Mr. President, I called attention to the fact that the attitude of this Republic has compelled Great Britain to change her policy, and that she is now projecting four "super-Hoods." Those are the ships to which the speaker, Sir Archer-Shee, is referring. He continues:

To meet that situation—

That is, the situation caused by the United States becoming a navalistic power, compels Great Britain to change her program, and she now proposes to lay down four ships. However, I desire to call attention to the fact that none of those war vessels will be commenced until 1922. I presume there is a hope that the United States will change its expressed determination to carry out the 1916 program or that an agreement may speedily be reached between the naval powers which will permit Great Britain to abandon the tentative plan of four "super-Hoods." Opportunity is to be offered this Nation and other nations to join the moral and peace-loving forces of the world in an effort to secure a reduction of armaments and to alleviate the destructive burdens which are resting upon the people. The speaker further says:

It is common knowledge that it takes several months after the matter has passed this House for contracts to be signed, and again six months, in all probability, for the material to be collected after the contracts are signed before the ships are commenced. These ships, therefore, will not be commenced until the beginning of the next year, and they may not possibly, therefore, be completed before 1925 at the earliest. It means that in 1925 we shall have constructed four modern ships, but the United States Navy will be in possession of more than four times the number of heavy ships.

There was further discussion in Parliament, and I see that distinguished Senators are alluded to. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], is mentioned by Lieut. Col. Archer-Shee, who states that one of the reasons assigned on the part of the United States for the construction of such a powerful Navy is that it is necessary to "direct cable communications with continental Asia and Central Europe." Then he proceeds—quoting from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]—

We share the common hope that armaments may be limited, and we may well wish to learn from Britain that if we join her in the limitation of naval armaments she will cease to build, not only on her own account but on Japan's account as well.

Then Lieut. Col. Archer-Shee proceeds:

He—

Referring to the Senator from Illinois—

went on to attack the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and the suggestion that it was directed against America, although that alliance has been clearly shown to the statesmen of the United States to be absolutely free of the slightest threat to the United States.

He refers to the heading:

Harding for disarmament. Hint to the Senate. McCORMICK's speech so interpreted—

and then proceeds:

Senator McCORMICK had just been to interview President Harding, and he went to the Senate and gave his views to contradict the views of Senator BORAH, who wants to bring about an agreement for naval disarmament. He—

Referring to the Senator from Illinois—

mentioned the Panama differential tolls. They do not want a Navy "large enough to fight England," in the words of Admiral Huse, of New York, in regard to the differential tolls of Panama. That can be dealt with in their own discretion.

The speaker continues:

We are faced with this situation, that by 1925 all our sea communications will be, to a certain extent, jeopardized, because another navy will have taken first place in the world. There is no country in the world which is so dependent on sea communication as this country. There is no other country in the world which has 75 per cent of its foodstuffs imported, and nearly all of its raw material, and which is absolutely dependent for its life upon it. There is no other nation in the world which has such vast possessions all over the world, amounting to one-quarter of the habitable globe and comprising practically one-fourth of the human race.

Mr. President, the record of the parliamentary debate reveals the fact as I read it, that British statesmen construe the action of the United States as being a challenge to the other naval powers of the world. When the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] visited President Harding and returned to the Senate, as he did during the last session of Congress, and advocated a powerful Navy and supported the proposition to drive through the program of 1915-16, the statesmen of Great Britain and the statesmen of Japan can not be blamed if they regarded his position as that of the administration; and when Senators declared it to be their purpose to outstrip the world in naval construction and reported a bill reaffirming that position, we can not complain if other nations take us at our word and regard our program as conclusive evidence of a determination to maintain naval supremacy. While they were and are seeking an agreement for disarmament, or for a naval holiday, we were spurning their propositions and demanding billions for naval construction; that is, we were insisting upon the execution of a program which when completed would cost billions of dollars.

Sir James Craig, to whom I have referred, presented a comparative statement to show the strength of the American Navy as well as the strength of the other great naval powers. In this comparative statement we have Great Britain, Japan, Italy, France, and Russia.

The report points out that it is not possible to forecast the relative strength in 1924-25, as this depends not only on the progress made in the respective building programs, but also upon the removal of older ships from the effective list. Sir James Craig adds that it is not considered desirable in the public interest to attempt to give an estimate of comparative values, as had been suggested. In this comparative statement an explanation is given of the naval strength of the nations just named. The letter "A" as employed denotes ships which, owing to their date, may be considered to embody lessons of the war. "B" indicates ships built or designed before this period. For battleships and battle cruisers "B" is divided into "B-1" dreadnaughts, and "B-2" predreadnaughts.

Of battleships "A" Great Britain has none. That is to say, Great Britain does not possess a single battleship that embodies the lessons of the war. Her ships will be obsolete, as the speaker to which I have just referred stated, when our ships are completed.

The United States now has one vessel that belongs to the category just named, Japan one, Italy none, France none, and Russia none.

Of battleships of the "B-1" class—that is, dreadnaughts—Great Britain has 22, the United States 17, Japan 5, Italy 5, France 7, and Russia 4.

Of the "B-2" class—that is, predreadnaughts—Great Britain has none, the United States 18, Japan 8, Italy 3, France 9, Russia 11; but the majority of Russia's are disabled.

Of battle cruisers of the "A" type—that is, that embody some of the lessons of the war—Great Britain has 1, the United States none, Japan none, Italy none, France none, and Russia none.

Of battle cruisers of the "B-1" type—that is, of the predreadnaught period—Great Britain has 7, the United States none, Japan 4, Italy none, France none, and Russia none.

Of cruisers of the "A" type, Great Britain has none, the United States none, and neither of the other nations has any.

Of the "B" type, Great Britain has 2, the United States has 15, Japan has 8, Italy 5, France 17, Russia 9, a portion of which are disabled.

Of light cruisers of the "A" type, Great Britain has 8, the United States none, Japan 3, Italy, France, and Russia none.

Of the "B" type, Great Britain has 43, the United States 15, Japan 14, Italy 10, France 11, and Russia 2.

Of flotilla leaders of the "A" type, Great Britain has 10, we have none, Japan has none, Italy has 2, France has 1, and Russia has none.



Of destroyers of the "A" type, Great Britain has 123, and we have 232. My understanding from the testimony is that we have 300; so this report underestimates the number of our boats in this column, as it does in a number of the other columns. Japan has only 30, Italy 6, France 19, and Russia 21, a portion of which are out of service; and I might say that many of these in Great Britain, as indicated by the memoranda here, are obsolescent if not obsolete.

Of submarines, Great Britain has 62 of the "A" type and 34 of the "B" type. We have 45 of the "A" type and 58 of the "B" type. Japan has but 7 of the "A" type and 16 of the "B" type. Italy has 11 of class "A" and 54 of class "B." France has 15 of class "A" and 34 of class "B." Russia has none of class "A" and 34 of class "B."

Mr. President, this comparative statement reveals that at the present time we have a Navy superior to that of any other nation in the world. I know that that statement is denied by many, but there are many facts to demonstrate its accuracy aside from the statement just referred to.

I again emphasize the position taken by British statesmen. We can not escape the damning indictment that we have driven Great Britain to revise her program, and to place upon the people of Great Britain additional burdens for naval armament. If we had pursued the path of wisdom and of reason, and had accepted the invitations of the great naval powers for consultation with a view to reaching an agreement for a reduction of armaments, undoubtedly this program would not have been presented, and the bowed nations of the world could have taken new hope in the knowledge that they were to be relieved of burdens which are made imperative if militarism and navalism are to rule the world. Of course when a powerful nation, such as the United States is, gives notice to the world that she intends to continue her naval program and to build the most powerful navy in the world, the suspicions and skepticism and, indeed, resentment are aroused upon the part of other nations. We can not conceive of a nation building these tremendous battleships and at the same time being devoid of some imperialistic ambition.

We attribute imperial ambitions to a nation when it announces a policy calling for a mighty navy or a powerful army. And following an exhaustive war there is greater ground for criticism if a nation declares for the "largest navy in the world."

When Germany was building her navy, and constructing the greatest fighting machine in the world, who could doubt that her ambitions were for territorial conquest, or her purpose to bring humiliation or defeat to some fancied rival in the field of commerce, or of economic and industrial development? The very fact that Germany did arm, and that Von Tirpitz was permitted to spend millions to construct a navy, excited the fears of other nations, and the result justified their fears; because when the thunderbolts of war had been prepared Germany struck, and the battle lines so extended that we became enveloped, and were compelled to fight for the honor and security of this Nation as well as for the cause of world freedom.

Will the world, with that picture before their eyes, look complacently and without suspicion or skepticism upon a policy by the United States which involves the expenditure of billions for naval armament? Will they not, upon the other hand, following the deductions that naturally arise from such conduct, assume that we have some ulterior designs, some imperialistic purpose?

That assumption is manifested in the statement of a number of English statesmen who addressed themselves to the question in the House of Parliament. Their justification is found in our conduct. They were willing to waive construction, but we prevented them from doing it and compelled a modification of their program.

When the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] returned from Europe and consulted with President Harding and came and made his speech in the Senate of the United States, England took note of it. He was regarded as an ambassador of the President to deliver a message to the Senate of the United States; and when the Senate said, "We are determined to push through that great program," Great Britain very naturally took cognizance of our course, and felt constrained to adopt measures calling for new construction and increased expenditures. Doubtless the statements of the Senator were regarded as expressive of the position of President Harding, and the conclusion reached that it was the policy of the present administration to have the most powerful Navy in the world. Such statements have frequently been made, that we must have the most powerful Navy in the world; and some of the continental papers and some of the papers in Japan, as I am advised, quoted statements made by Americans to the effect that we should have a Navy equal in size to those of Great Britain and Japan.

Mr. President, we have jingoists in the United States who seem to desire another conflict. They have not been satiated by the blood of the past, and apparently they would be willing to have our country again plunged into war. There are Americans and American newspapers constantly asserting the possibility, indeed the probability, of war between the United States and Japan or Great Britain.

During the last session of Congress the leader of the Republican Party upon the other side [Mr. LODGE] moved that the Senate proceed in executive session to the consideration of important questions. I would not speak of it except for the fact that the newspapers the next day and for days following quoted with remarkable accuracy what was stated by the Senator in his able address to the Senate, and the reply which was made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Of course, I can not state what occurred in executive session, but the newspapers said that there was imminent danger of war with Japan, that the immigration question and the Yap controversy were likely to provoke conflicts between the United States and Japan, which might culminate in war.

I ask Senators what effect newspaper reports of that kind would have upon other nations? We are presumed to be at amity and peace with Japan and Great Britain, and yet it has been stated upon the floor of the Senate that war with Japan was quite probable and that Japan was the foe we must fear.

Then there are some of our citizens who insist that a conflict with Great Britain is not only possible but probable. There are some people in the United States who are trying to prevent amicable relations between the English-speaking peoples of the world. There are some people in the United States who desire to sow the seeds of discord between this Republic and Great Britain.

Some, we know, are actuated because of their hatred of England and their love of Germany. They would like to see this Republic enter into an alliance with Germany to the exclusion of other nations, and have the two nations flout the rest of the world. They would like to see the league destroyed and Germany relieved from the conditions which the Versailles treaty imposes upon her. A world hegemony—for the United States and Germany—some desire.

During the campaign it was said that when the Republican Party came into power it would not only "scrap" the League of Nations but destroy the Versailles treaty, and that a treaty would be entered into between the United States and Germany under which an alliance would be formed and the United States would furnish raw materials to Germany, and the industries of the latter would thereby be resuscitated and she would become the industrial and the economic power of Europe. America was to contribute to Germany's European primacy, and our supremacy in the Western Hemisphere was not to be questioned.

There are persons who would be glad to see all associations with Great Britain discontinued, who would be glad to see a hard-and-fast treaty binding the United States and Germany.

I might say, parenthetically, that I shall be glad to see the United States and Germany enter into friendly relations, but I am opposed to any policy which divides the United States and her former associates in the World War. I believe, Mr. President, that when the war is over it should be over. I do not believe in maintaining rancor and hatred and resentments. Germany has been defeated. Let her acknowledge her defeat. Let her seek, in an honorable way, honorable relations with the allied nations and with this Republic and I will be glad to join in welcoming Germany not only into the great union of nations of which we form a part—if we can not ratify the Versailles treaty, then I am in favor of a fair and just treaty with Germany.

But make no mistake. The American people are not willing that the United States shall desert the Allies or forsake France and Great Britain and Italy and the other nations which stood with her in the great contest. The American people desire the good will and friendship of the German people, but they are unwilling to betray the Allies, abandon the ideals which inspired this Nation in its glorious efforts. They fought to crush militarism, preserve national honor, and secure the safety of civilization. We want the peace of the world, and Germany is a part of the world, and we must have peace with Germany, as we desire peace with other nations. But we want no war with England, we want no war with Japan, and there is no occasion for controversy between the English-speaking peoples or between the United States and Japan. When we set an example for peace, when we justify our moral leadership in the world, other nations will be glad to follow. Mr. President, the nations of Europe to-day are anxious to know what the policy of the new administration in this country will be.



Mr. BORAH. Would it interrupt the Senator if I should call attention to an editorial in the *Scientific American* which came to-day?

Mr. KING. I should be very glad to yield.

Mr. BORAH. I quote from the *Scientific American*, for the reason that that magazine has always been an advocate of a great Navy, and in connection with what the Senator said, it seems to me, coming from the source from which it does come, this editorial is worthy of consideration, even by the Senator who is now in charge of the bill. The editorial reads:

WHO IS DELAYING DISARMAMENT?

There can be no question whatever that the country at large was dumbfounded to learn, as it did a few months ago, that over 90 per cent of the current national expenditures are to cover the cost of wars that have occurred in the past and that may occur in the future. It was this material fact as much as, and perhaps more than, the moral aspects of the question that produced the practically universal demand for a reduction of naval and military estimates.

In response to the taxpayers, the Government, through its various representatives, from the President down, has stated during the past few weeks that we must at any cost complete the three-year program, including the six ships of the *Indiana* class, although these last will cost about \$250,000,000. At the same time, in answer to the widespread desire of American citizens that our President should take the lead in calling a conference to discuss disarmament, the people have been told that we can not afford to undertake disarmament alone, and that the President must be given time for due consideration of this matter before calling such a conference. Meanwhile Congress is voting that we spend about \$400,000,000, for this year alone, upon our Navy.

Having reference to the bill as passed by the House. The bill as reported to the Senate carries about \$500,000,000.

The astounding thing about the statement that we can not consent to disarm until other naval powers agree to do so with us is that the only other naval power that has hitherto surpassed us in strength not only commenced disarmament more than two years ago but has carried the thing to such an extent that, first, it is questionable whether to-day she equals us in the power of her first fighting line; second, it is certain that if we complete our three-year program in its entirety our Navy will exceed the British Navy in capital strength by at least 30 per cent; and, third, if we also round out our Navy, which will be a comparatively inexpensive thing to do, we shall exceed that Navy in actual material strength by at least 50 per cent.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this is from a journal which has for years given attention to the question of the Navy, its proper building, its efficiency, its strength, and its supremacy. It has been recognized as an authority upon the subject, and does not belong to that class who are denominated "small Navy people." The editorial continues:

Startling facts, but true; for we must remember that the British first-line ships are obsolescent to-day, being with one exception from 5 to 9 years old, and that by the time the 17 capital ships which we have under construction are completed the finest of her ships will be from 8 to 12 years old. The question which we wish to ask Congress on behalf of the people of the United States who wish for economy is: Why is it that, in making these Government statements that we must go slowly in calling for a conference of disarmament, no acknowledgment whatsoever is made of the fact that the biggest navy in the world has already made this enormous stride in this very direction? Surely this is a fact pregnant with meaning, upon which the people of America have a perfect right to be informed.

That we are not unduly stressing a minor point, but that we are laying our hand upon a most significant and elemental fact, is proved by the reply to a question raised in the British House of Commons on April 13 as to the number of vessels that had been removed from the naval lists of Japan, the United States, and Great Britain since the armistice. The parliamentary secretary to the admiralty said that the phrase "removed from the naval list" had been taken to mean scrapped, and on this basis the figures are as follows: Japan has scrapped 2 light cruisers and 4 destroyers; the United States has scrapped 5 battleships of the dreadnaught class, 1 cruiser, 3 light cruisers, 21 destroyers, and 14 submarines; and the British Empire has scrapped 38 battleships of the dreadnaught and dreadnaught type, 2 battle cruisers, 87 cruisers, 300 destroyers, including flotilla leaders, and 106 submarines.

With such evidence of good faith before us, why do we hesitate to call a conference for the mutual adjustment of naval strength and the all-round reduction of naval and military financial burdens?

I ask the Senator to pardon me.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Idaho is a Republican; I will not vouch for his good standing in his party, but whether his standing be good or bad in the party, he is an able man and a worthy statesman; as a Democrat I want to ask the Senator, as a Republican, why his President—our President—has, if we are to believe the newspapers, indicated that he did not want adopted by the Senate a resolution of the character which the Senator from Idaho heretofore offered, that we should not now attempt to negotiate an agreement or convention with the great naval powers of the world for the purpose of reducing armaments, and relieving the people from the burden of billions of taxes. What reason is there for it?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think the President has said it. I do not wish to question the veracity of anybody who has reported it to the newspapers; neither do I wish to question the veracity of the newspapers. But I think a mistake has been made. I do not think the President has said that he did not want that resolution adopted.

My opinion is that if the President of the United States had anything to say to Congress upon so vital a matter, he would

say it in a manner which becomes the President of the United States, and he would not pass it through subterranean channels to those whom he thought it might affect, and who might wish, by reason of the fact that the fleshpots of Egypt have not yet been closed, to keep on the good side of the President.

My candid opinion is, from a conversation which I had with the President himself, that he has made no such statement, and I take this opportunity to say that if any gentleman wishes it to be understood that the President has said any such thing, he ought to be willing, in view of the momentous question which is before us, to say it and say it publicly, and state when and how the message was given, and just what it was.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think, in view of the fact that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], who is in charge of the bill and who is not here at the present time, was quoted by the newspapers as having made the statement to which the Senator from Idaho refers, that it would be well to wait and make that charge when he comes on the floor of the Senate, and then he can answer for himself.

Mr. BORAH. I had forgotten, if I ever knew, that it was the Senator from Washington who made the statement or that the Senator from Washington did make it. I greatly respect the Senator from Washington as a Senator and as a man.

Mr. HALE. I think the papers stated at one time that he did make the statement.

Mr. BORAH. I was not seeking to reflect upon the Senator from Washington individually; I had no such thought. I only wished to express the strong belief that if the President had any communication to make to Congress, such communications would be in a dignified and open way and not through subterranean passages and by way of the newspapers.

Mr. HALE. I do not think the Senator need fear that the President of the United States will communicate with Congress or with anyone in a manner that is not dignified and proper.

Mr. BORAH. I assume that that is just what he will do, and therefore I assume he has not communicated in another way. In addition to that, I had a conversation with the President myself.

Mr. HALE. I will say that I went to see the President with the Senator from Washington, and we talked over the question of disarmament, and I gathered from what was said there that the President thought it was not necessary for Congress to go ahead in this way with a resolution asking for disarmament.

Mr. BORAH. If anybody conveyed to the President the idea that Congress was instructing him, they conveyed what is not correct. Congress is not attempting to instruct the President what to do. It is expressing in a manner which the President as a Senator has approved and in a manner quite in harmony with the rights and dignity of the Chief Executive the views of Congress upon a momentous question, in which the people whom the Congress represents are gravely and deeply interested.

Mr. HALE. I presume a request from Congress would be more or less in the nature of an instruction.

Mr. BORAH. No; it is the very opposite. In the Senate Chamber we never pass a resolution instructing the President concerning matters which relate to the President's duties, but we have time out of mind and repeatedly, even when we signed the "37" round-robin proposition, advised the President upon a matter; we requested him at least. I wonder where those 37 have disappeared, who are now so sensitive about passing a simple resolution expressing the desire of the Congress of the United States that something of this kind shall be done.

Mr. KENYON. That was unofficial, was it not?

Mr. BORAH. It was signed by Senators.

Mr. KENYON. They might prefer an unofficial round robin.

Mr. BORAH. It was signed by Senators. I wish to say, before I sit down, in view of the fact that the Senator from Washington is absent and that it may not be understood when I was speaking that I was speaking about an individual, if the Senator from Washington has a message, while I would much prefer to hear it from the President, I trust the Senator from Washington will deliver the message which the President delivered to him. Then there will be opportunity for the Senator from Idaho to deliver the message which the President delivered to him.

Mr. HALE. I do not know whether the Senator from Washington has a message to deliver to the Senate at the present time. If he has, the Senator can ask him when he returns to the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. As I said a moment ago, I had a conversation with the President about this matter. I did not put it in the newspapers because I did not assume it was for the benefit of the Congress, and when I saw this other matter published in the newspapers I paid very little attention to it. It did not seem to me to be sufficiently direct or sufficiently authentic to call for consideration.



Mr. KING. Mr. President, when I was interrupted by the Senator from Idaho in order that he might present an editorial from the Scientific American I was commenting upon the report that the President of the United States had indicated that the time was not propitious for Congress to express its views upon the question of disarmament. To put it mildly, I was amazed to read that report. It did not seem to square with the views which I had supposed the President of the United States entertained upon the question of the reduction of armament. I could not believe that the Executive would express disapproval, in advance at least, of a course which the Senate and the House of Representatives had the undisputed right to pursue.

I deny that it is the right of the President of the United States, whether Democrat or Republican, to interpose in order to deter the Senate or Congress from expressing its view upon a question of policy so vital to the country and to civilization as the question now before us for consideration. When did it become an offense for the Senate or for Congress to express its views upon the question of armament or disarmament? Why, Mr. President, in 1916 Congress passed a bill which was stronger than a mere resolution such as that which was tendered by the Senator from Idaho directing and empowering the President of the United States to call a conference or to participate in a congress of the nations of the world in order to agree upon a plan to secure world disarmament and world peace.

Was that an invasion of the prerogatives of the President of the United States? Would it be wrong morally or legally for the Senate of the United States or for Congress now to say that in its opinion the time has come to disarm or to reduce armaments, or to call together the great naval powers of the world for the purpose of securing a convention that will relieve the peoples of the world from the great burdens that are now pressing upon them?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republicans, in a speech delivered upon the League of Nations, called attention to numerous precedents wherein the Senate had requested the President to adopt certain policies with respect to foreign matters. He justified the Senate's action, if I construed his attitude correctly, in participating in matters relating to our foreign relations. The Senate has more than a legislative function. It is a part of the treaty-making power. If the Senate desires a treaty with other nations that will secure a reduction of armaments, it has the undoubted right to express its views. The Senate has the right to say to the President of the United States, "It is our view and desire that a treaty be negotiated with the other nations looking to the reduction of armament and to the pacification of the world."

In the days of Andrew Jackson—and that is one of the cases cited by the Senator from Massachusetts—the Senate passed a resolution respectfully urging him to negotiate a treaty of importance to the United States.

What has come over our Republican friends? Do they tremble to-day in the presence of the Executive of the United States? Certainly, the "fleshpots of Egypt," to which the Senator from Idaho referred, would not deter eminent statesmen and brave and courageous men, as all are upon the other side of the Chamber, from adopting a course that their conscience and their judgment and their devotion to country dictated should be pursued.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has just indicated, if I interpreted his remarks correctly, that the President of the United States had intimated—and if I quote him incorrectly I hope he will correct me—that this was not quite the time to present the question of disarmament. I would prefer to have the Senator state what was said, because then I can not be put in the attitude of misquoting him.

Mr. HALE. I stated that my impression, after talking with the President, was that he considered that this is not the time to go ahead with a resolution of this kind. Of course, the Senator realizes that our foreign relations at the present time are extremely delicate and that the country at large is looking to the President to straighten out those foreign relations.

Under the circumstances I do not think, so far as I myself am concerned, that we need advise the President what to do in the matter of making treaties. I think we can safely leave it to him. So far as the resolution is concerned, there was a resolution when the 1916 program was adopted which was passed by Congress looking forward to disarmament. I think we can let it go at that without taking any action at the present time. I am simply speaking for myself.

Mr. KING. I have confidence in the President of the United States. I believe him to be a high-minded Christian statesman, and desires the welfare of this country and the peace of the world. But the President of the United States is not omniscient.

His vision, great as it is, does not prevent other men from having vision and well-founded convictions upon foreign affairs. There is nothing inappropriate in the Senate, if it desires, expressing its views upon international questions. Some Republican Senators—and I do not say this by way of criticism—and some Democratic Senators, let me add, felt that President Wilson, before he went to France to negotiate a treaty, would have strengthened his position by consulting with the Senate. That statement was made by Republican Senators in this Chamber and out of this Chamber, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. BORAH. While I am very glad he did not, nevertheless if he had the Versailles treaty would have been in very much better condition to-day, I have no doubt, than it is.

Mr. KING. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator mean that the President of the United States has not consulted Senators about matters that have to do with our foreign relations?

Mr. KING. I am not in the confidence of the President. He has not consulted me. I feel quite sure he has not consulted any Senator on this side of the aisle, but I am not complaining. I do recall, however, that Senators upon the other side of the aisle cited the course of Washington, when President of the United States, in conferring with the Senate concerning treaties and our foreign relations, and approval was signified by Republican Senators of such policy. There are numerous examples of the Senate, by resolution, expressing its views upon foreign matters. Henry Clay sought to have action taken by the House in relation to the dealings of the United States with South American peoples. President Wilson in various messages to Congress stated his position upon the terms of peace which should be embodied in a treaty with the Central Empires, so that the country was generally advised as to his intentions when he went to Paris to take part in the peace negotiations. It is quite likely he would have avoided some opposition if he had freely consulted with Senators prior to his departure.

Mr. HALE and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. KING. I will yield first to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], because he rose first, and then I will yield to my friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HALE. I do not care to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KING. Then I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah that my recollection is that President Wilson did confer with members of the Senate and that he submitted a tentative plan of the League of Nations and of the peace treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is not that true?

Mr. KING. I had that in mind and was about to come to it before being interrupted by the Senator from Alabama, and I thank him for his interruption.

As I was observing, while it is possible President Wilson might have succeeded better if he had consulted the Senate before going overseas concerning the treaty to be negotiated, nevertheless it is a fact that when he brought back a tentative draft, as the Senator from Alabama suggested, of the treaty, he invited the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to the White House, when a full discussion took place concerning the draft, and the President responded to the numerous questions propounded to him. Among those who asked questions of the President was the present President of the United States, who was then Senator from the State of Ohio. President Wilson welcomed suggestions, and carried back proposed amendments which were embodied in the final draft of the treaty.

Mr. President, I see no impropriety in, nay, I think that it is eminently proper for Senators if they have views upon a question of such transcendent and vital importance as the one now under consideration, to respectfully communicate them to the President. As a part of the treaty making branch of the Government their views may well be of value to the Executive.

Why should not the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] be adopted? In view of the statement made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as to the President's attitude concerning the question of disarmament I am somewhat curious to see how many Republicans will vote for the resolution. I inquire of my friend from Idaho if there was a single Republican who voted against his resolution when it came before us for consideration a few weeks ago?

Mr. BORAH. My remembrance is that it had unanimous support upon this side of the Chamber, as I presume it will again have.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, notwithstanding the sagacity of the Senator from Idaho, he assumes the prophetic rôle as to the course of some of his colleagues, particularly where an intimation has come from the Executive. I respectfully suggest that he is exhibiting great recklessness.



Mr. BORAH. I said I presumed that I would have unanimous support for the resolution.

Mr. KING. The Senator as a lawyer knows that there are conclusive presumptions and rebuttable presumptions; what dignity this presumption will rise to I venture no opinion.

Mr. BORAH. I must presume it, because to presume otherwise would be to presume an influence which ought not to be exerted upon a Senator.

Mr. KING. I feel sure that this colloquy between the Senator from Idaho and myself will make converts on the other side, and I am sure that Republican Senators now will be constrained, regardless of any fear they may have had lurking in their hearts heretofore, to stand with the able Senator from Idaho in unanimously adopting the resolution which commanded the unanimous support of the Senate only a few weeks ago.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, in view of the fact that there are now only eight Senators in the Chamber, where he expects these converts to come from as a result of the debate?

Mr. KING. Sometimes, Mr. President, the truth, discovered or proclaimed in this Chamber, percolates beyond these walls. Perhaps those who are absent in body are here in spirit.

Mr. BORAH. And vice versa.

Mr. KING. It is possible that Senators who are absent when measures are under consideration, and who may be disposed to oppose them, may be impressed with the facts here presented, a knowledge of which reaches them; and it is possible that they may receive enlightenment from their constituents, who are not oblivious to questions here presented, particularly where some great moral issue is involved.

I hope the American people will speak upon this question. I hope the Christian men and women of this Republic will lift their voices against a policy that spells war and is a challenge—a menacing challenge—to the peace-loving peoples of the nations of the world. I hope Senators who are not here, and who have in the past given their support to a naval program which develops and strengthens the militaristic spirit, will reconsider, and that the wisdom for which we pray and the spirit of justice and peace, which should be our guide, will influence the final result, and thus promote the welfare and happiness of all.

Mr. President, the matter before us involves more than dollars and cents, although dollars and cents are important. This bill calls for the expenditure of \$500,000,000 directly. It pledges or commits us to the expenditure of considerably more than a billion dollars. It calls for a Navy the maintenance of which will cost the United States more than one-half billion dollars annually. The naval program, huge and expensive as it is, is imperfect and incomplete, and millions of dollars more will be immediately required to complete it. The program is not properly balanced, and hundreds of millions more will be required to complete an efficient and modern Navy. We are to stagger forward borne down by the awful load of taxation which this foolish policy demands. But let us for a moment look at the moral side of the question.

The vital, the supreme questions of life are far above the material standards which alone are followed by some. Wealth may perish and the achievements of the finite mind be destroyed; but the moral and spiritual framework of the universe is enduring. We must fit our actions and our lives into this framework or we fail in our duty and our mission. We should now rise to the moral plane in dealing with this subject. We speak too much of the pecuniary cost of navalism and too little of the moral loss and moral cost which result. What is the just, the righteous course to pursue? What course will most conduce to the peace and happiness of mankind and to the honor and glory of God? Are we serving humanity and the cause of justice by adopting a policy which excites distrust and fear and resentment? We want the confidence and esteem of the world. We want them to love this Nation, not because of its strength and power and wealth, but because of its justice and its unsought and unselfish leadership in the moral world.

The war has left Europe distracted and the people groping for light and salvation. The sufferings and tragedies through which they have passed have shaken their faith in the mercies and goodness of God. They strike out blindly, often madly. In their despair they need help, and the stimulating and inspiring example of a calm, serene, and self-contained people. They have lived in war, and the clash of arms still resound in their ears. This puissant Nation should steady the world. Thank God, we can do it, and in serving the world we strengthen and serve ourselves. We should cry aloud for

peace, we should set the example for peace. We should with burning zeal seek to draw the frenzied peoples of the earth into a serener life and into the paths of peace and fellowship. America must lead the way. If we are to lead the way for peace, we must act in the interest of peace. It is only a few short months since we held the leadership of the world. This Republic, under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, rose to sublime heights and enjoyed a moral primacy that has never come to any nation in the past.

The great and the small nations believe in us—in our altruism; in our humanitarianism. The Starry Banner of this Nation took on added glory and became the symbol of moral greatness and spiritual power. America, the beloved child of God, became the Prophet and the Savior to mankind. We entered the war without malice or hate; we fought not for revenge or conquest. We gave and gave freely—yes, joyfully—in the cause of justice and to establish peace and righteousness among men. That is what history will say of us. Let us not mar our glorious record. Our work is not finished; the task is not concluded. The world needs us still. Our future, our peace, our welfare, as well as our unfinished work, all cry aloud for further service and continued moral leadership. Let us speak for peace and point the way to world union under the reign of justice.

President Wilson may have made mistakes, but he struggled to attain his ideals—ideals which will survive and triumph in the end. I say he had ideals. The American people had ideals. He was one of them, and expressed in eloquent words the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of the people. They wanted peace; they desired to aid the world to emerge from the lurid flames of war. He went overseas seeking to consummate that great end. Europe, as I have said, was torn, disordered, distracted, and she has not yet recovered from the horrors and agonies of the long years of war. We can not expect the people of Europe to take the same calm, dispassionate view of world questions as will be taken by us. We should now point the way; we should call them back from hate and vengeance, from war and the spirit of war, and point the way of peace and justice and righteousness.

If this Nation shall not lead, what nation, I pray you, sir, will lead? What nation will bear the standard of justice and righteousness and peace in the world if it is not carried by this great Republic? We are the heir of all the ages, the legatees of the wealth, moral and spiritual, and the forces which have come down from the past, and as the servant of a Great Master we are expected to use our talents and not hide them in a napkin, to use the parable of the lowly Nazarene. Our light must so shine so that it will illumine the world. America must take the lead in the great forward movements which carry humanity.

How are we taking the lead? Is our cause now leading to peace and world amity? When the nations pray for peace and ask us to join them in an international conference for the reduction of armaments, we deny their appeal; and the Senator from Maine says the President of the United States intimates that now is not the time to participate in so worthy a cause. When is the time? Ah, I will tell you, Mr. President, when the time is if we are to follow the navalists. It is when we are irretrievably committed to a navalistic policy. When we are armed to the teeth and when we have the biggest Navy in the world and, perhaps, a Navy larger than the navies of any two powers in the world, then it will be time for us to speak for peace. The argument ought not to commend itself to just men and Christian men.

Where do you find justification in the philosophy of Christ? Where do you find it in morals? Epictetus and the philosophers of ancient times taught a truer philosophy than that. Marcus Aurelius preached a better doctrine than that; the philosophers of China thousands of years ago preached sounder morality. We, a Christian people and the leading Nation of the world, say to those who are crying for peace, "We will give you peace after awhile; when we are fully armed and have naval supremacy in the world, then we will talk peace and the possibility of reducing armaments."

If two men have a controversy, one of them does not say, if he sincerely desires justice, "When I have beaten you, when I have possession of the property in controversy, then we will talk of compromise."

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that if the Chief Executive of the United States should seek to interpose objection to an effort by an expression by Congress of its views upon the question of disarmament, he would be doing himself an injustice and committing a wrong against the American people.

When the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] had the floor a moment ago the question arose as to the expenditures made



by the nations for naval purposes, and in his time and by his courtesy I called attention to naval appropriations made in the year 1914-15. Let me put into the Record other figures.

In 1900-1901 Great Britain expended for her navy—and that included all expenditures for construction, maintenance, and so forth—\$145,000,000 plus. I will give the first figures and not the hundreds of thousands. The United States in the same year expended for her naval purposes \$61,000,000, Germany \$37,000,000, and France \$72,000,000.

In 1901-2 Great Britain expended \$150,000,000, the United States \$68,000,000, Germany \$46,000,000, and France \$67,000,000.

In 1902-3 Great Britain expended \$150,000,000, the United States \$82,000,000, Germany \$48,000,000, and France \$59,000,000.

In 1903-4 Great Britain expended \$173,000,000, the United States \$104,000,000, Germany \$50,000,000, and France \$59,000,000.

In 1904-5 Great Britain expended \$179,000,000, the United States \$116,000,000, Germany \$49,000,000, and France \$60,000,000.

In 1905-6 Great Britain expended \$161,000,000, the United States \$109,000,000, Germany \$54,000,000, and France \$61,000,000.

In 1906-7 Great Britain expended \$152,000,000, the United States \$98,000,000, Germany \$58,000,000, and France \$59,000,000.

In 1907-8 Great Britain expended \$156,000,000, the United States \$120,000,000, Germany \$80,000,000, and France \$62,000,000.

In 1909-10 Great Britain expended \$181,000,000, the United States \$122,000,000, and Germany \$95,000,000. The Kaiser had determined to prepare in a military and naval way to carry out his ambitious projects and he felt the importance of a large navy. For the same year France appropriated \$64,000,000.

In 1910-11 Great Britain expended \$202,000,000, the United States \$111,000,000, Germany \$103,000,000, and France \$74,000,000.

In 1911-12 Great Britain expended \$211,000,000, the United States \$123,000,000, Germany \$107,000,000, and France \$80,000,000.

In 1912-13 Great Britain expended \$224,000,000, the United States \$129,000,000, Germany \$109,000,000, and France \$81,000,000.

In 1913-14 Great Britain expended but \$237,000,000, the United States \$136,000,000, Germany \$112,000,000, and France \$90,000,000.

In 1914-15—that would carry Great Britain into the period of the war—Great Britain expended \$260,000,000, the United States \$141,000,000, Germany \$113,000,000 only, and France \$123,000,000.

So that, Mr. President, the highest figure reached by Germany for naval expenditures prior to the war and including one year of the war was \$113,000,000, and our highest appropriation was \$141,000,000. Now we are appropriating \$500,000,000 plus, because I make the prediction that if this bill shall pass in its present form we will be called upon to meet deficits and other expenditures for the Navy which will swell this sum millions of dollars. But, as I said a moment ago, and I repeat it, this is not all. This is for maintenance, and only \$90,000,000 to be applied upon the construction plan of 1915, which means hundreds of millions of dollars more. In the minority report which I submitted at the last session upon the Borah resolution I showed that this program would involve, before it was completed, in the neighborhood of three billions of dollars for maintenance and for the construction of other craft which would be demanded as a complement to this program.

Nor does that figure provide for such further construction as might be called for. England and Japan, meeting our challenge, feel compelled to revise their programs, and when we have spent three billions of dollars our ships will be obsolete in the main, and if the naval madness continues we will be compelled to make further appropriations totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. While the world hungers for peace, our Nation, which should lead in the movement for world peace, is to turn a deaf ear to the piteous appeals.

Will the American people follow such a program? I warn Republicans and Democrats mad with this militaristic spirit; you will be rebuked by the American people. The mothers and fathers of our country, the Christian people of the land, will demand now, as they have done in the past, that war shall end, and that their representatives join with the nations of the world in writing a program which will put into operation what the hearts of all desire.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not going particularly to discuss the items in this bill at this time. I understand that the item now to be voted on is the coal item.

Mr. HALE. I believe it is.

Mr. KENYON. I will ask the Senator what page it appears on.

Mr. HALE. Page 35.

Mr. KENYON. I want to say just a word about that, Mr. President.

This proposition is to increase the item for coal and other fuel from \$17,500,000 to \$25,000,000. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if an explanation of that has been made?

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] put into the Record yesterday certain information about that matter. I think he has some further information to give on the subject.

Mr. KENYON. I hope we shall have that before we are called upon to vote. Of course, Mr. President, I realize that if we have the boats we must have coal for them; but apparently now the American taxpayers are going to be robbed of \$7,500,000 on the coal proposition, which leads me to go back in memory to the last session, when we had the coal proposition before the Manufactures Committee. It had arisen under exactly the same circumstances, apparently, that are arising now to frighten the country on the coal situation, and have everybody rushing to buy coal in order to put up the price. They are having interviews sent out, some statements even coming from Members of the Senate, advising people to hurry up and buy their coal. We tried to get legislation at that time. We reported a bill to the Senate. It, of course, slept the sleep that that kind of a bill generally does in the Senate—a bill for some control of the coal situation in this country. That was laughed at as freakish legislation, socialistic legislation; but we shall be facing—and mark the prediction—exactly the same condition again in this country in the fall, and the same tactics are being pursued to bring it about, and we are reaping one result of our failure to act at the last session in this increase of \$7,500,000 for coal.

If we had had some kind of control of this great natural resource of the country, the people would have secured the coal in the winter days to come at a less price than they are going to secure it. This is not a good kind of a day to talk about coal; I know that; but I am simply taking this opportunity to reflect back to the negligence of the American Congress in being afraid to attack that great proposition, being so terrified by the great industries that control at least the anthracite coal in the United States that they were afraid to pass any kind of legislation on the subject.

That is one of the items in this bill.

Mr. President, I had not expected to enter into discussion of this naval bill. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] have carried on the discussion very thoroughly. I wish the discussion could go on for a few days, in order that the people of this country, burdened with taxation as they are, that the farmers of this country, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] so well pointed out, struggling with debt and facing bankruptcy, could understand the proposition that the Senate of the United States shall add \$100,000,000 to the \$400,000,000 carried in the House bill. Whenever you happen to say anything about the Navy or question any item in the bill, such as \$2,500,000 for a hangar in California, something for real estate projects, you are met with the inquiry: "Why are you not in favor of an adequate Navy for the purpose of defending your country?" Of course we are. I believe in a strong Navy under present conditions, and we must have a strong Navy until we can reach some plan of partial disarmament for the world. We will never have complete disarmament; that is a dream. If we had had complete disarmament in the world, the barbarians would have taken the world. But there should be some plan to cut down the present armaments and these tremendous naval expenses. There is no doubt in the world that Great Britain is yearning for an opportunity to join with the United States on that proposition.

I do not understand why we do not do something. The Democratic administration did not do anything, but I am in hopes the Republican administration will do something. I see no reason why the Senate of the United States should not express itself on this disarmament proposition. I want to help this administration in every way I can, help make it a success, but I do not propose to surrender my conscience upon any subject, and I do not believe the President of the United States expects or desires anybody to surrender his conscientious convictions upon any of these subjects.

All through this debate there have been 10 or 12 or 5 or 6 Senators listening. No attention is paid to it. I do not suppose that outside of the Naval Affairs Committee there are 10 Senators in this body who can tell anything that is in this bill. The word has gone out to pass the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—



The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that during the debates on all the great appropriation bills the Senate is usually empty, perhaps half dozen Senators who are interested in appropriations being on the floor? We spend millions of dollars with but very few Senators paying any attention.

Mr. DIAL. I would like to ask the Senator if there was any minority report presented on this bill?

Mr. KING. With the consent of the Senator from Iowa, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I think I am the only one on the committee who is opposed to this bill. I did not file a minority report because of press of business, but I hope my dereliction in that respect will be compensated for by the speeches I have made.

Mr. DIAL. The Senator has done his part.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the point I am trying to make is this, that because Senators object to certain items in the bill, because Senators favor disarmament and a resolution looking to that end, they can not be put in the position of being opposed to a Navy sufficiently strong to protect this country.

I desire to call attention to the following provision on page 5:

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, \$8,125,750; for navigational, photographic, and aerological equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1921, \$49,250.

Mr. President, I notice that the Army expense for that identical matter, for which in the naval bill we are asked to appropriate \$8,125,750, is only around \$4,000,000. Why so much more for nearly the same thing in the Army?

Again, the appropriations for aviation in this bill amount to \$18,729,000. The naval aviation service, as I am informed upon what I believe is good authority, is only about a third that of the Army, and the appropriation for the Army for this purpose is only around \$19,000,000. So that with a third of the equipment and a third of the work, the naval appropriation bill carries within a few hundred thousand dollars of what the Army bill carries.

We probably have a right to inquire concerning these articles in this bill without being false to the high standards of our country, and I desire to call attention to another item, on page 6—

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion, his comparison between the expenditures for the Army and Navy for the same items only illustrates that within the Government itself, within one nation, there is the same competition between different arms of the service that there is between the different nations of the world in regard to the military programs of the several nations. If we build a lot of new battleships, that is used as an argument in other countries to build a lot more, and when they build a lot more we use that here as an argument to increase ours. The item for the Navy of which the Senator speaks will be used as an argument to increase the item for the Army, and after it has been increased in the Army it will be used again as an argument to increase it for the Navy.

Mr. KENYON. And that may be true, but I believe that the Army bills, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], have been held down to a remarkable degree. Last year they reduced the force of the Quartermaster's Department about 40 per cent, and the Army have made no new purchases of lands, buildings, and things of that character, such as are provided for in this bill. The chairman of that committee is entitled to much credit.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I would like to say, as far as the difference between the Army and Navy in the matter of aviation is concerned, that aviation has been carried on to a great extent in the last few years in the Army, but in the Navy it has not been carried on to such an extent. With the introduction of plane carriers, and the probability of having great quantities of airplanes to go out with the fleet, it has become of prime importance to develop this branch of the service, and the committee has considered that in every way aviation in the Navy should be encouraged and kept up, which accounts for the rather large appropriations we have allowed in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Speaking about aviation, I wanted to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not there has been any test between the Army and the Navy as to the effect which airplanes would have upon battleships as to sinking them?

Mr. HALE. I think there have been tests. I do not think they have reached any satisfactory conclusion, however. I think in the maneuvers which are to be held the latter part of next month and in July the matter is to be thoroughly tested out, and it is hoped that we can arrive at some solution of the matter.

Mr. BORAH. It occurred to me that perhaps that test was not hurried prior to the passage of this bill.

Mr. HALE. I have never heard any such reason given for not holding the test.

Mr. BORAH. I have, and I heard it from one of the most distinguished airplane experts in the United States.

Mr. HALE. In the Army?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. He said that the Navy has positively sidestepped the issue, delayed the test, procrastinated on it, and refused the test in one way or another, and they have been unable to bring it to an issue.

Mr. HALE. I have never heard any such reason given for it, and the committee has never heard of it. I can not conceive that it is so.

Mr. BORAH. In the first instance, I understood they were to turn over the battleship *Kentucky* for the purpose of the test. After much delay they concluded that they needed the battleship *Kentucky* for another purpose. Then they suggested that they would turn over the battleship *Alabama*, and now there has been some delay about turning over the battleship *Alabama*.

Mr. HALE. I think a test was made on one of the battleships, and certain claims were made about the hits that were made, and there was some question about whether those claims were justified.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and it also appeared that the explosions from bombs from the airplanes had such effect that a photographic view of it was prohibited from being sent out by the Navy. Is there anything to that?

Mr. HALE. I do not know.

Mr. GERRY. On those tests that were made on the *Indiana* the explosions did not take place from bombs that were dropped from the air, but the explosions took place from bombs which were placed on vital parts of the battleship by naval officers in order to see the effect of them, and the testimony of the experts was that even when they were placed on the battleship the resultant explosions were not sufficient to sink the battleship.

Mr. BORAH. What experts? One of the most distinguished experts in the country told me that he would agree to sink in 30 minutes any battleship you people would give him.

Mr. GERRY. Of course, with the Navy unable to shoot back, and the airplane operating not subject to gunfire, which, of course, makes a very different condition than that during war.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know about that proposition. I am simply stating that the aircraft people claim that the Navy refuses the test.

Mr. GERRY. But if the Senator from Iowa will permit me, the test made, when bombs were placed on a battleship so that there could be no question of missing, showed that the explosions were not sufficient to sink the battleship, which seems pretty conclusive evidence that the development of the bomb has not proceeded as far as some of those in favor of it seems to think it has.

Mr. BORAH. I think it was more conclusive evidence that the Navy did not want to go any further.

Mr. President, it has been conveyed to me in the most authoritative way that the Navy is unwilling to have this test; that it has procrastinated and delayed it from one cause or another, particularly until the passage of this measure. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I have my opinion about it, and my opinion is that it is correct, because it is conveyed to me in such a way that I am not permitted to doubt it. But now we are building 16 battleships, which some of the great experts of the English Navy and some of the experts of the American Navy maintain can not withstand the attacks of airplanes.

It would seem that if we are going to expend this vast amount of money, as a mere matter of business we would test that question before the money is appropriated; and I am informed that the Navy people are unwilling to have it tested until after the money is appropriated.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am merely calling attention to that item as one of the things which it seems to me we ought to have more light on.

On page 6 is another amendment added to the bill as it passed the House, "for the construction of a hangar for rigid dirigible and other necessary improvements at Camp Kearny, Calif., which are hereby authorized at a limit of cost not to exceed \$2,500,000." This is an item needing explanation.



If we take the House bill, it seems to me we can pass that without question. It seems to me the items which are added to the House bill ought to receive the most careful scrutiny of the membership of this body and ought to be discussed. Here is an amendment for the expenditure of two and a half million dollars for a hangar at Camp Kearny, as referred to before. Can we not get along without that for a while, when we are talking and preaching about economy in this country?

Again, following along through the bill, there is provision for a summer school for boys. I do not know just what the necessity of that is. It does not carry such a large appropriation, only \$200,000, but if it is not absolutely essential at this time that item ought not to be passed.

The Senator from Idaho has said to-day that we are not hearing much about economy. I wish to say to him that he is going to hear a lot about economy when a certain bill that is now before the Committee on Education and Labor is brought before the Senate in a short while, I hope, a bill that carries a million dollars a year for a few years to help save the mothers and the babies of the country, a bill for stimulation of the States in helping on that problem. When that bill comes before the Senate with only approximately a million dollars a year to be appropriated, I hope the Senator will listen to the speeches that will be made for economy. Two hundred and fifty thousand babies a year dying in this country because they do not have the proper attention, thousands of mothers not properly cared for, a great humanitarian measure that passed the Senate at a previous session, and yet now we are meeting with opposition, with the statement that we can not do that; we must economize. A million dollars a year! The Senator from Idaho will hear plenty of speeches about economy and saving the public money when that bill gets before the Senate, although we can spend two and a half times as much on a hangar out at Camp Kearny in California. Do not be discouraged, I will say to the Senator from Idaho. He will hear enough about economy then.

On page 27 of the bill I should like to know something about this item, if it is not out of place to try to find out something about it:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire 1,000 acres, more or less, at or near Camp Kearny, Calif., for a site for a lighter-than-air aviation station and to pay for the same an average price of not exceeding \$100 per acre out of any funds appropriated for aviation purposes.

If that is essential, all right. If that is necessary in taking care of the strong Navy, if we must have it, all right. But if we do not have to buy a thousand acres of land at this time, let us not do it. So we can wander on through the bill, finding items establishing new bases, new sites throughout the country, especially in the West, and other items of expense.

I do not know whether we here exactly understand the feelings of the people of the country. I do not know that Senators have been out in the farming communities and know how the farmers of the country are feeling just now, not able to meet their debts, burdened with taxation as they have not been for years, discriminated against by the Federal Reserve Board in the days gone by, credit extended, and then told to liquidate at once. They are not doing much complaining. They are not squealers. They have taken their losses and taken their bumps as no other class of people in this country have taken them. They are putting in their crops to-day under the most discouraging circumstances they have ever faced, with the old crop largely on their hands, with no market and not knowing but what one crop is going to bump into the other.

Nevertheless they are going ahead with a patience and a courage and an industry that might well be an example to the other people of the country. But they are going to inquire, and they have a right to inquire, when it is impossible for them to get credit to bridge over this difficult period, why the American Senate is so liberal in adding \$100,000,000 to the House bill in the creation of instrumentalities to go out and destroy their fellow beings. They have a right to inquire and they are going to inquire. They are going to take some interest in the politics of the future.

Is it not a dreadful thing, Mr. President, that the backs of the people of this world must be bent in toil and labor to raise the money to buy things to kill off one another? As long as present conditions exist we have to do it. I do not think any sane man can argue against a strong and powerful navy for this country under present conditions. But why can we not start with the other peoples of the world and try to stop this enormous expenditure of money—one nation after another, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out this afternoon, chasing each other in the naval program circle. We are simply answered, "Well, now is not the time. It is impossible to do it now." For God's sake, when is the time ever coming? After

going through this war, with millions of men killed and billions of property destroyed, was there ever a more propitious time in the whole history of the world to sit down and talk it over with other nations of the world? If this is not the time, then the time will never come.

There is no one doubts Britain's position. Britain and the United States standing together can bring about world disarmament, but we are always met with the one thing—Japan! So we talk war with Japan and Japan talks war with us, and we drift along toward a war which would be the crime of all the centuries. I do not know how it can be handled, but certainly let us start on it. I wish we could have a commission of the ablest men in this country to go to Japan, men like Root and Taft and Alton Parker and other men of that character, to meet a like commission from Japan, to put our cards upon the table and be frank and say to them, "We do not want any war; we will not make war on Japan, and you ought not to want war. We are not interfering in your plans and you need not interfere in our plans. What is the matter with you, anyhow? Put your cards on the table. If you want war, you will have to make the war, and if you ever make war on the United States there will not be anything left of your islands. But we do not want war. Silly, foolish thing!" Do not you believe that the good sense of Japan—and they are a sensible people—would meet us on that kind of a proposition?

Let this great Christian Nation, devoted to the highest ideals of the world and leading the world in everything else, lead off frankly in this movement. It would not be long until the whole world would join in it. If we do not do it, we are going to hear from a class of voters in this country that have lately come into the right of suffrage. You laugh about it in the cloakrooms. Some denounce their bills in the cloakrooms and vote for them on the floor. But the great, potential, powerful force of this country that is eventually going to drive Congress to take up some kind of a disarmament proposition and that will drive the world to it is the mothers of the country, the new class of women voters of this country. You will listen to them when you will not listen at all to the men. They are going to force partial disarmament throughout this old world. Mark that!

Mr. President, I rose merely to talk about coal and I have wandered away. I should like to discuss the bill further at some time before a final vote is reached.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator before he leaves that feature?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator was speaking about Japan. Undoubtedly there is a militarist power in Japan, and any conference would have to deal with the militarist party; but there is no longer any doubt that the people of Japan are, just the same as the people of Great Britain and the United States, anxious for disarmament. There is every evidence of that. It is characteristic of governments generally to be militaristic, whether the people are or not. I wish to call attention, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. To a statement issued a few days ago by Dr. Iyenaga, a Japanese of very great distinction, who, it is said, speaks for his Government, though not officially. He said:

The Japanese Government would welcome a conference looking toward reduction of naval programs. \* \* \* It is utterly foolish to think that Japan could compete with the United States in a program of huge naval expansion without bringing financial ruin upon the Island Empire. \* \* \* The dispute over the island of Yap will be settled through diplomatic channels.

Such is the opinion expressed by Toyokichi Iyenaga, director of the East and West News Bureau, and regarded by some as semi-officially reflecting the views of Japan. His declarations, above summarized, as to the general situation between Japan and the United States, the Yap controversy, and Japan's naval expansion, were made in the course of an authorized statement from the Japanese standpoint which Dr. Iyenaga had been requested to prepare for consideration by American readers.

Further on, he said:

If either Great Britain or the United States should propose a conference with Japan looking toward reduced naval programs, and as a logical sequence partial disarmament afterwards, it is my profound conviction that the suggestion would be most heartily welcomed by the Japanese Government and the Japanese people. I may say frankly that we Japanese feel that it would be wisest and most proper for the United States to take the initiative in such a movement. It may be remembered that not long ago Mr. Ozaki, formerly Japanese minister of justice, and also mayor of Tokyo, introduced in the Japanese House of Representatives a resolution providing for a conference with Great Britain and the United States looking toward reduction in naval programs and toward a reduction in military programs to be made in accordance with decisions of the League of Nations. This resolution was voted down, one of the chief reasons for its defeat being that Japan feels it would be presumptuous for her to take the initiative in such a move. And Mr. Kato, Japanese minister of naval affairs, said that Japan was willing to consider a reduction in her naval program if the



United States and Great Britain would agree to a conference and succeed in devising a certain formula of naval equipment in accordance with the needs of the respective countries as dictated by geographical, political, and other considerations.

In an article published a few days ago in a Japanese journal it was said:

A powerful protagonist of disarmament has spoken in Japan, the rich Rihel Hyuga, managing director of the Oriental Sugar Manufacturing Co. His liberal and progressive ideas, expressed in a letter to the archmilitarist, Yamagata, has perturbed that proud prince and thrown the military party into a ferment.

In a double sense it is to be hoped that Hyuga will not lose his head and will be able to add such impetus to the movement against militarism that the Japanese will turn from their policy of aggressive imperialism and seek the ways of peace and good understanding with all nations.

Among the magnates of southern Japan his opinions evidently are widely shared, but in the north, where battleship building goes on apace, enriching contractors and providing labor with fair wages, the propaganda of reasonable pacifism has failed of its proper effect.

The world must not expect too much of the peace propaganda, even though it is fostered by one of the powerful industrial chiefs of Japan. The militarists have closed the doors against the light as Germany did for 40 years.

Hyuga seems to place great dependence on the education of the Japanese, but it was one of the saddening anomalies of German civilization that education made no headway against militarism. On the contrary, the militarists were able to put the nation's savants at work for militarism and imperialism and even the socialists found themselves insensibly indoctrinated with the views of the junker class in so far as the army and navy were concerned. Scientists, philosophers, historians, novelists, playwrights, the schools, the churches, the press; in fact, all the agencies of instruction played the game of militarism for power, pelf, or petty office.

We fancy that the game is being played with as great or greater effect in Japan, where all the sources of information are controlled with a grip that even the mailed fist in Germany did not possess.

To Yamagata the sugar magnate puts the case in this forcible and vital language:

"What Japan needs is fewer dreadnaughts and more education," he said to the correspondent. "Do you realize," he went on, "that 83 per cent of the boys who want to study in our middle schools, which correspond to your upper grammar-school grades, are unable to do so because there is no room, and that in the higher schools conditions are even worse? How can Japan hope to enter into commercial competition with the people of the West when her teeming new generations are not, and can not be, sufficiently educated? This is so fundamental a truth that it is scarcely worth dwelling upon; yet Japan is ignoring it, hoping to succeed without the essential fundamentals."

"Do you know why universal suffrage would not, perhaps, solve the problem? It is because our people are not educated up to the responsibilities of suffrage. And our elected Diet does not represent the will of the people."

"Do you know why in northern Japan the disarmament campaign has not gone forward so much as in the south? It is because so many firms and individuals in and about Tokyo depend for their very existence upon the building up of the Japanese Navy, which means contracts to shipbuilders and dock companies and profit to the thousand and one interests which fatten on a swollen navy and on increased armaments generally."

I read that to call attention to the fact that while there is the militarist party in Japan and in Great Britain and in the United States, the people in all three of those countries are in the same attitude of mind toward the question of disarmament, and if one great leader should start the movement, should lead it, and ask for a conference, and the Government of any one of the three nations or of the two nations, Great Britain and Japan, should refuse to confer upon the question of disarmament or should refuse to agree to disarmament, neither one of the Governments could withstand the opposition of its people there. The Japanese Government in such a case would be overthrown, or the ministry of Great Britain would be overthrown if they refused to enter into a disarmament agreement.

We can never hope, Mr. President, to accomplish disarmament if we hesitate because the militarist representatives of a particular Government declare that it is impossible, that they will not accede to it. We can only hope to get disarmament if we organize and direct and utilize the public opinion of the different nations and the moral force of the people of the different countries.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Idaho does not believe that the people of Japan want war with the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly not.

Mr. KENYON. Nor do the people of any other nation on earth?

Mr. BORAH. I do not believe the Japanese people desire war. As I have said—I do not want to be misunderstood—I have no doubt there is a militarist party there; but so far as the masses of the people are concerned, I do not think they desire war with the United States.

Mr. KENYON. Those who would have to go out and fight are not looking for war?

Mr. OVERMAN. Why is not now the time to take the lead in the movement for disarmament? Has not the Senator from Idaho introduced a resolution looking to that end?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Idaho has done so.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me if he has done so that we ought to pass it.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. I heard both the speeches of the Senator from Idaho on the subject, and I heartily indorse them.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina indorses them. The Senator from Idaho says that the people of all these nations are for disarmament or for partial disarmament, and I agree with that. Is there no way for the people to get what they want?

Mr. BORAH. Let me read another item which I overlooked. This is a dispatch from Tokyo:

JAPANESE, IN MASS MEETINGS, CALL ON PEERS TO SUPPORT DISARMAMENT. OSAKA, JAPAN, March 12.

At two mass meetings here yesterday, attended by thousands of persons, resolutions were adopted declaring that the budget gives preponderating importance to armaments, which places an unbearable burden on the nation and is contrary to public opinion. It was decided to send messages to the members of the House of Peers, asking their support in the disarmament movement.

Speeches favoring disarmament were made by prominent business leaders. Prof. Suchiro, of Kyoto University, declared that Japan should take the lead in an international discussion for disarmament. If this were done, he said, all questions which have been the subject of discussion between Japan and America would rapidly be solved.

Some one sent me some photographs of these mass meetings which were being held in Japan, and it looked to me not only like thousands but hundreds of thousands of people were in attendance upon them.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, as the able Senator from Idaho has stated, the people in these different countries are for a movement looking toward disarmament. I believe that is eternally true. Now, if it is, I ask the Senator from Idaho is it possible when the people of various countries want something that there is no way of getting it? Is there a false pride that makes us stand back and makes them stand back for fear that if we suggest it to them we are compromising our position?

Of course, my illustration is not good, for I could not have any quarrel with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], but if he and I grow suspicious of one another and people go to him and tell him things I have said about him, and they come to me and tell me things he has said about me, and we grow apart and hard feeling develops, just as in the case of nations; if he and I should sit down at a table and talk the matter over squarely and fairly, we would not have any difficulty.

I fear the people of the different nations are suspicious of one another. Let us talk it over with them and end suspicion. Suspicion is the mother of hate and wrong.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator from Iowa, and I should like to make a suggestion on that point. I understand that some oppose the resolution which, as I understand, has been submitted by the Senator from Idaho. The Senator and I represent in part the people of our respective States. I know what the people of North Carolina think about this question, and he knows what the people of Iowa think about it.

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. All Senators know what the people of their respective States think about it. Why do we sit here and do nothing when the leadership is being taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to bring about the thing we want? Why should we hesitate, when we are representing the people, because somebody is opposed to it?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from North Carolina and I, I take it, are not going to hesitate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not going to hesitate about it a minute.

Mr. KENYON. I wish the President of the United States to go ahead even if the proposal of the Senator from Idaho does not carry, and I assume he will, for I think he is just as much devoted to the idea as we are.

The Senator from North Carolina says we represent the people of our respective States. The people of the United States are in favor of some proposition looking to partial disarmament; there is no question about that; and as to the people who would drag us into war for Yap you would not find them anywhere near Yap when the war was on. I inquire of the Senator from Idaho if he has presented his proposal for disarmament?

Mr. BORAH. I have given notice of it, and it has been printed.

Mr. KENYON. I hope it will be adopted, and if there is time enough given in this debate for it to get to the country it will be adopted.

Mr. President, I rose to discuss the coal question, and I have wandered far from it. I now ask to have read from the desk an editorial appearing in the Washington Herald on



Monday, May 5, on the coal question. I make the request because the subject enters into this debate. The coal situation is one of the factors that make it necessary to increase the appropriations for the Navy. It is a question we have got to face in legislation before many days. I ask the Secretary to read the editorial, and with that I will desist for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NORRIS in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

COAL PRICES MUST COME DOWN.

Coal producers who are berating the public for not loading up now with coal for next winter at war inflation prices might as well save their breath. At a time when steel plants, textile mills, railroads, express companies, and other industries are readjusting war inflation wages, cutting war inflation production costs, and lowering war inflation prices, the coal trade can not expect to stay in the war inflation clouds and get away with it.

What the coal business needs to do to sell its coal is to offer its product to the public at a right price, like any other manufacturer or dealer. If it does not do that the coal trade is not going to sell its coal. It is of no use to tell the public that unless it buys its coal now at the excessive prices demanded for it the public next winter will freeze to death at still higher prices. The public is not going to buy the coal at these excessive prices and the public is not going to freeze to death.

The time has come for plain speaking to the coal producers who think they can sit tight on war inflation wages, war inflation production costs, and war inflation prices to the public when everything must be readjusted. Either they must act to bring about the economic readjustment which is imperative in their business as in every other business—either they must thus provide the cheaper coal, or Federal, State, and local Governments, backed by all the power that is in the American people, will get on that job for them.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has said; in what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has said; and also in the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. I did not have the pleasure of hearing the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], as I was in attendance upon the hearings before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the time he addressed the Senate.

Mr. President, I can not understand how Congress or any part of Congress is going to defend its position in failing and refusing to take a step toward permanent international peace. In 1916 Congress did not think that it was trespassing upon the rights and privileges of the President when it inserted in the naval appropriation bill of that year a provision requesting the President to call the nations of the earth together not later than the end of the war then raging in Europe for the purpose of working out some plan of international peace, for the purpose of bringing about disarmament, for the purpose of settling international disputes by arbitration.

That provision went into the bill, and my recollection is that there were not 15 Democrats and Republicans in the two Houses of Congress who voted against that provision. As a Member of the other House I supported that provision, and I will support a provision now looking toward the same accomplishment.

Are we to be told to-day that the great Government of the United States, the greatest of all the Governments in the world, is not going to be permitted to take her stand on the side of peace in the future? Are we to understand that this Government of the people is going to be taken over by those who profit by the making of guns and ammunition, by the building of battleships and other war equipment and used to put money in their pockets? Are we to understand that the Public Treasury is to be thrown open to those who desire to increase their fortunes at the expense of the taxpayers of America? If that is not the proposition, what is it?

Where is the danger that threatens this great Republic of the western world? What Government is it that now threatens our liberties? What Government is it that causes us to stand in dread and fear of its power? If there is no such Government, why are we called upon to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars at such a time as this when the taxpayers are already overburdened? It has been intimated that the people who are to profit by such a program are politically powerful. Shall they have their way to the detriment and injury of the rank and file of the patriotic people of our country?

The people who want taxes reduced and who are opposed to committing the United States in time of peace to a program of unnecessary war preparation are also politically powerful. What consideration are you giving to them? Those who are here urging you to provide stupendous war equipment will make millions of money if their plans are successful. Then there are those who want universal military training in the United States. Certain people will make big money out of that, furnishing guns and other kinds of war implements. That will tax the people many millions more. It is wrong to tax the people for the folly and the crime of plunging them headlong down the

road of militarism, the terrible road down which Germany went to her fall.

Are we going to sit here in silence and permit that to be done? The boys who fought in France and those in training here at home and ready to go have a right to be heard in this matter.

Mr. KING rose.

Mr. HEFLIN. What is this Government for? It is for the benefit and general welfare of the citizen. Would you say that we are conducting it for the benefit and welfare of the citizen when we permit certain concerns to move upon the Treasury and shovel into their own coffers the money of the people? Shall we permit them to impose additional burdens upon the taxpayers by making curious noises in the dark and shaking a little yellow flag in the face of the American people and crying, "Look out, there is danger from Japan"?

Why, Mr. President, it reminds me of the story of the little red ant that placed himself on a railroad track in the West. He stood up on his hind legs and said: "I see coming in the distance a big passenger train, the Cannon Ball, and I am going to wreck it. When the engineer sees me standing erect on the rail he will be filled with dread and consternation, and when he blows the whistle, giving the danger signal, the conductor will cry out in vain to the passengers, who will scream with fear as they poke their heads out at the windows just before I wreck the train and destroy them all." The poor little ignorant, egotistical ant stood there for a moment, but the engineer did not even see him on the long shining rail. The conductor did not know that he was there; the passengers were unaware of the little ant's threatening attitude, and when the train had passed on there was just one little greasy spot left on the rail where the little ant had been.

If Japan has no better sense than to perch on the rail of this Republic's certain road of progress and destiny, there will be nothing left to tell the story of her folly but a little greasy spot. We are able to do this, and other things if necessary, with the war equipment we now have.

Mr. President, we are told that last year of every dollar wrung from the purse of the people in the way of taxes, 93 cents went for war purposes. Think of it! Ninety-three cents out of every dollar going for war equipment and on the war debt. For educational purposes, the care of our wounded soldiers, farm demonstration work, the building of transportation lines out amongst the millions of people in the way of dirt roads and rivers and harbors, public buildings, and everything else, just 7 cents out of the dollar, and 93 cents is turned into this other channel for war purposes; and the war is over, and I feel that we should do everything in our power to prevent the recurrence of another such war.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator has passed by the point to which I desired to call his attention; but, if I may recur to it—

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator was speaking about the munition makers, and those who would profit by the maintenance of this naval program. An admiral who appeared before our committee, in response to a question, as I recall, which I propounded to him stated as follows: I was asking as to whether we could not suspend the naval program for some little time, with a view, of course, to securing an international agreement for a reduction of armaments, and he said:

I would have no figure on that; but the contracts have been let.

Let me say, parenthetically, that some of them, most of them, have been let, but upon some of them no work has been done. As I said yesterday, indecent haste was made in letting those contracts, so as to commit us to that program.

Some of the big concerns throughout the country are going ahead, and the stuff is pouring in, and the greatest loss would be in the holding up of the contracts. That would have a very great effect. I understand that a number of our biggest concerns are practically depending on these to tide them over until they get more work, but that would probably be the principal effect of it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, think of that! That is right in line with the thought suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. The farmer could not get any money to tide him over when the crisis was on. He is down, prone upon the ground, and the merchant and banker in his locality are suffering with him. He is selling his substance far below the cost of production. There is no governmental hand that reaches down to him to pull him up and tide him over this awful time of distress; but these other big concerns that the Senator from Utah speaks of say they want this business to keep them going until normal conditions return.

That is favoritism and class legislation in its worst form. There are more farmers, merchants, and bankers that are in



distress in the agricultural sections than there are of any other class of people.

I am for an adequate Navy. We have to-day the best Navy in the world, except that of Great Britain. We have a great merchant fleet, the greatest in the world except that of Great Britain, and in some respects ours is an improvement over that of Great Britain. We have half the wealth of the world right here in the United States. We are the greatest war power in the world now on land. Great Britain may be somewhat a little more powerful on the sea, but on account of the resourcefulness of this Government and its man power we are the greatest war power in the world to-day; and here you are shaking this little yellow rag and saying, "You had better go ahead and tax your people for big war equipment. The Japs will get you if you do not."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] comes in with a resolution asking for a step to be made in the interest of reduction in armament and world peace for the future. Disarmament? No, no. You say, "Wait until we arm ourselves, until we are by far the best armed Nation in all the world, then we will walk out displaying our armor, bristling with bayonets and groaning beneath the weight of our own war equipment and war burdens, and hold up to the other nations of the world the dove of peace." Why not make the effort now to bring about an understanding with regard to war equipment for the future?

The world is weary and sick of war. We must not permit those who love military glory and those who make money out of war equipment to cause us to lose the great opportunity that is ours as a Nation to prevent cruel, murderous war in the future.

I want to remind Senators on the other side that the House, controlled by your party, defeated Congressman CONNALLY's amendment to this bill which merely suggested that the President extend an invitation to the other nations for the purpose of proposing and discussing plans for disarmament and universal peace. Do you indorse that action of the Republican House? Are we not going to be permitted, as I said in the outset, to come out and register our position on the side of peace? Why should we hesitate a moment in the matter of advocating arbitration and disarmament? The people all over the country would like to know.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything upon this subject to-day.

As the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has said, President Wilson went a long way toward establishing world leadership for this Nation. We had that leadership and your side of this Chamber deliberately threw it away. We stood on the mountain top of the world in the affections and gratitude of the nations. Must the nations of the world who have heard us preach against big standing armies and stupendous war equipment in time of peace now conclude that this Christian Nation was insincere?

Senators, the people of this country are not with you on this proposition. The boys who offered their lives on the far-flung battle line in France are not with you on this proposition. The fathers and mothers of America are not with you on this proposition. The young men and the young women who love peace and hate war are not with you on this proposition. The taxpayers who must bear the burden are not with you on this proposition. Those who make big money making battleships and the gun and munition makers, they are the fellows who sit back and clip their coupons and listen to the clink of Federal dollars as they fall into their coffers.

Mr. President, I want to close with this statement: When we support a movement that looks toward disarmament and the settlement of disputes by arbitration, which means peace in the world, we are following the teachings of the lowly Nazarene; we are following the Scripture, which says, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God"; and yet the United States Government by the vote of the Republican House is not permitted to come out on the side of peace so that she can be called a child of God. What will be the verdict of the Senate when this matter which affects the present and future of our country is presented to us? Let us vote on the side of the future peace of the world.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I present the conference report on the immigration bill, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

I might say that as the bill stands it is the bill as it passed the Senate, with some verbal changes. As Senators know, the bill in the form it assumed as it passed the Senate was an amendment to the bill as it passed the House. The House has receded from the changes which it made in its bill, which sub-

stantially enlarged and liberalized the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate, notably the provision which exempted from the 3 per cent the subjects of religious persecution, and other exemptions which are contained in the bill as it passed the House, which enlarged the 3 per cent exemptions.

I might say that there is one inconsequential amendment aside from the verbal changes. The Senate conferees did agree to an amendment to the bill as it passed the Senate, which admits children under the age of 18 of American citizens. If they were not admitted it might lead to great hardship. The number of minor children of American citizens who could possibly come in under this provision would be very limited. The Senate conferees did consent to that change in the bill as it passed the Senate. But all the main provisions of the bill as it passed the House, which enlarged the maximum number under the 3 per cent provision, the House receded from and agreed to the bill as it passed the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island about how many children the committee figures will come in under this change?

Mr. COLT. The reports we get from the Commissioner of Immigration are to the effect that the number would be very small, and that they would be brought in only in cases of extreme hardship. Take the case of an alien who has become an American citizen and wants his minor child here, who, of course, was born abroad. This amendment will take that class out and make an exemption of them.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that a number of instances came to the attention of the conferees—and I was one of the conferees—where American citizens had gone over to get their children. The man having taken out his naturalization papers his wife becomes an American citizen, and the committee thought it would be a great hardship to have the father and mother American citizens and the little children overseas denied the right of entrance. The evidence before the committee showed that the number would not be very great. We felt it was a matter of justice and right.

Mr. COLT. And I might say, especially as the House receded on all the substantial changes.

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand, then, really the main point of difference between the House and the Senate was on the question of the provision to admit those who had been the victims of religious persecution, the adoption of which might have resulted in the admission of hundreds of thousands in addition to the 3 per cent.

Mr. COLT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The House receded on all those additions to the 3 per cent, except the one proposition of the admission of the children of citizens of America, under 18 years of age?

Mr. COLT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And the number will be inconsequential, as I understand it?

Mr. COLT. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, a question of parliamentary procedure. What is the business now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEWBERRY in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island has asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the immigration bill.

Mr. HALE. Is not the business before the Senate the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. LODGE. The presentation of a conference report is, of course, a privileged matter at any time. An objection to its consideration can then be interposed.

Mr. HALE. I take it that when the Senator asks for the consideration of the conference report he means to ask that the naval appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. COLT. I had the permission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], in charge of the naval appropriation bill, to call up the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the naval appropriation bill, if that is necessary.

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection to that, but I ask the Senators who have the immigration bill in charge if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] knows of this report?

Mr. COLT. I do not think he does. Of course, the Senator from Missouri is aware that the bill passed the Senate with only his vote against it. I am not aware whether he knows about the report or not.

Mr. BORAH. The only thing that leads me to ask is that I know his intense opposition to the measure, and I do not know whether he would like to be present or not.



Mr. KING. I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that the Senator from Missouri is out of the city, in Richmond. I have no information as to when he will return. As I recall, he was the only opponent to the bill when it came to a final vote.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Missouri was at luncheon in the Capitol Building at 2 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. He was in attendance on the Finance Committee until about quarter past 12 to-day.

Mr. KING. Col. Halsey advises me that he phoned his office less than 10 minutes ago, and the answer was that the Senator had gone to Richmond. That is the only information I have.

Mr. COLT. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report on the immigration bill? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the report.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That as used in this act—

"The term 'United States' means the United States, and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens.

"The word 'alien' includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

"The term 'immigration act' means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled 'An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States'; and the term 'immigration laws' includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

"Sec. 2. (a) That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910. This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act: (1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) aliens in continuous transit through the United States; (3) aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (4) aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure; (5) aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration; (6) aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act; (7) aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands; or (8) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States.

"(b) For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

"(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act. In case of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting (1) in the

creation of new countries, the governments of which are recognized by the United States, or (2) in the transfer of territory from one country to another, such transfer being recognized by the United States, such officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910 who were born within the area included in such new countries or in such territory so transferred, and revise the population basis as to each country involved in such change of political boundary. For the purpose of such revision and for the purposes of this act generally aliens born in the area included in any such new country shall be considered as having been born in such country, and aliens born in any territory so transferred shall be considered as having been born in the country to which such territory was transferred.

"(d) When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted, all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded: *Provided*, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad, aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, aliens belonging to any recognized learned profession, or aliens employed as domestic servants, may, if otherwise admissible, be admitted, notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of the same nationality admissible in the same month or fiscal year, as the case may be, shall have entered the United States; but aliens of the classes included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall (unless excluded by subdivision (a) from being counted) be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act: *Provided further*, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées, (1) of citizens of the United States, (2) of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law, or (3) of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and have been separated from such forces under honorable conditions.

"Sec. 3. That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect. He shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted to the United States between the date this act becomes effective and the end of the current fiscal year, and on June 30 thereafter he shall publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted during the ensuing fiscal year. He shall also publish monthly statements during the time this act remains in force showing the number of aliens of each nationality already admitted during the then current fiscal year and the number who may be admitted under the provisions of this act during the remainder of such year, but when 75 per cent of the maximum number of any nationality admissible during the fiscal year shall have been admitted such statements shall be issued weekly thereafter. All statements shall be made available for general publication and shall be mailed to all transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States who shall request the same and shall file with the Department of Labor the address to which such statements shall be sent. The Secretary of Labor shall also submit such statements to the Secretary of State, who shall transmit the information contained therein to the proper diplomatic and consular officials of the United States, which officials shall make the same available to persons intending to emigrate to the United States and to others who may apply.

"Sec. 4. That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

"Sec. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced 15 days after its enactment (except secs. 1 and 3 and subdivisions (b) and (c) of sec. 2, which shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this act) and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted during the remaining period of the current fiscal year, from the date when this act becomes effective to



June 30, shall be limited in proportion to the number admissible during the fiscal year 1922."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LEBARON B. COLT,  
WM. P. DILLINGHAM,  
WILLIAM H. KING,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

ALBERT JOHNSON,  
J. WILL TAYLOR,  
JOHN E. RAKER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 14, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12), 1921.*

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles C. Madison, of Missouri, to be United States attorney, western district of Missouri, vice James W. Sullinger, appointed by court.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Inslee C. King, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Tennessee, vice Frank W. Flenniken, appointed by court.

##### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

##### UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

William Daryl Patterson, of Wisconsin, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy, by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, vice J. B. Boutelle, retired.

Oliver Scott Reading, of Illinois, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy, by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, vice R. F. Luce, promoted.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12), 1921.*

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Peter H. Miller, of Florida, for northern district of Florida.

##### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Robert H. Lucas for district of Kentucky.

Bert P. Gage for twenty-eighth district of New York.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### CALIFORNIA.

Alice C. Webster, Antioch.  
Ambrose E. Burkhart, Bishop.  
Daniel S. Devine, Hermosa Beach.  
Finis L. Bigelow, Maricopa.  
David W. Morris, Modesto.  
George V. Beane, Mojave.  
Isabelle F. Sylvia, Pleasanton.  
William H. Brown, Riverbank.

##### OREGON.

William J. Warner, Medford.

##### WASHINGTON.

Henning E. Johnson, Du Pont.  
Leonard McCleary, McCleary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 13, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Heavenly Father, we bless Thee for Thy holy ministries. While the consciousness of our own existence was lost in sleep Thou wert our guardian angel. We come again asking the sweet sense of Thy presence, as Thy love and wisdom are never exhausted. Pity us in our daily weakness, and help us in our daily labor. Answer all silent cries of those who are burdened and heavy-laden, and turn their tears into jewels and their sighings into prayers. Bless all families that are separated. Be there as well as here, and here as well as there, and may all hearthstones be as true as they are familiar, and as familiar as they are true. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is obvious that there is no quorum present.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Focht	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.
Ansorge	Free	Mann	Shreve
Bird	Fuller	Mead	Sisson
Bond	Funk	Morin	Slomp
Bowers	Gallivan	Mudd	Snyder
Brinson	Gilbert	Nolan	Stiness
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	O'Connor	Stoll
Buchanan	Gould	Ogden	Strong, Pa.
Burdick	Graham, Pa.	Padgett	Sullivan
Burke	Hukriede	Paige	Thomas
Campbell, Pa.	Hutchinson	Patterson, N. J.	Tinkham
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Perkins	Towner
Cockran	Kahn	Perlman	Upshaw
Copley	Kendall	Rainey, Ala.	Vare
Cramton	Kennedy	Ransley	Volk
Crowther	Kiess	Reed, W. Va.	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Kitchin	Riddick	White, Me.
Deal	Knight	Robison	Williams
Dunn	Kreider	Rodenberg	Winslow
Fairchild	Lee, Calif.	Rogers	Wise
Fields	Lee, N. Y.	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Fish	McFadden	Rossdale	Wyant

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to suspend further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FUTURE TRADING IN GRAIN.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The unfinished business of the day is the bill taxing grain futures, on which the previous question was ordered on the third reading. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] demanded the reading of the engrossed bill. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to withdraw it?

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his request.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. HILL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

Mr. HILL. To offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit. Is he opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland also offers a motion to recommit. Is he opposed to the bill?

Mr. HILL. I am.



The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Texas a member of the committee?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Maryland a member of the committee?

Mr. HILL. I am not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HILL moves that the bill taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery, and so forth, be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a motion to recommit with instructions is privileged over a motion to recommit without instructions. My motion is to recommit the bill with instructions.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman refer the Chair to any authority?

Mr. BLANTON. That was my idea. Of course, I do not carry authorities around with me in my pocket, as the Speaker does. But I submit to the Speaker that if that is not the rule, it ought to be.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, even if it were the rule—which it is not—the motion for the previous question has been made and the previous question has been ordered. It is too late to make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. The preferential question was made before the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Regardless of that, the rule is clear. The Chair can entertain a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland to recommit the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded. Those in favor of the motion to recommit will rise and stand until they are counted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Fifteen Members have risen—not a sufficient number. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 211.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. MCARTHUR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 69, not voting 92, as follows:

## YEAS—269.

Abnon	Buiwinkle	Cullen	French
Andrews	Burke	Curry	Frothingham
Anthony	Burrongs	Dallinger	Fulmer
Arentz	Burtness	Darrow	Gahn
Aswell	Butler	Davis, Minn.	Garrett, Tex.
Atkeson	Byrnes, S. C.	Davis, Tenn.	Gensman
Bankhead	Campbell, Kans.	Denison	Gerner
Barbour	Campbell, Pa.	Dickinson	Goldsbrough
Barkley	Cannon	Dominick	Goodykoontz
Beck	Cantrill	Doughton	Graham, Ill.
Beedy	Carew	Dowell	Green, Iowa
Begg	Carter	Drane	Greene, Mass.
Bell	Chandler, Okla.	Drewry	Griest
Benham	Christopherson	Driver	Griffin
Bixler	Clague	Dunbar	Hadley
Black	Clarke, N. Y.	Echols	Hammer
Blakeney	Classon	Elliott	Hardy, Colo.
Blair, Ind.	Clouse	Elston	Hardy, Tex.
Bland, Va.	Cole	Evans	Harrison
Boles	Collier	Fairfield	Haugen
Bowling	Collins	Fess	Hawley
Rox	Colton	Fisher	Hayden
Brand	Connally, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Hays
Brennan	Connell	Flood	Herlick
Briggs	Cooper, Ohio	Focht	Hersey
Brooks, Ill.	Cooper, Wis.	Fordney	Hickey
Brooks, Pa.	Coughlin	Foster	Himes
Brown, Tenn.	Crisp	Frear	Hoch

Huddleston	Lowrey	Pringey	Swank
Hudspeth	Luce	Purnell	Sweet
Hull	Luhning	Quin	Swing
Ireland	Lynn	Rainey, Ala.	Tague
James, Mich.	McClintic	Raker	Taylor, Colo.
James, Va.	McCormick	Ramseyer	Taylor, Tenn.
Johnson, Ky.	McDuffie	Rankin	Temple
Johnson, Miss.	McFadden	Rayburn	Ten Eyck
Johnson, S. Dak.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Reavis	Thompson
Johnson, Wash.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Reece	Tillman
Jones, Tex.	McSwain	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Kearns	Maloney	Rhodes	Tincher
Keller	Mansfield	Ricketts	Treadway
Kelly, Mich.	Mapes	Roach	Tyson
Kelly, Pa.	Michener	Robertson	Underhill
Ketcham	Miller	Robison	Vestal
Kincheloe	Millsbaugh	Rouse	Vinson
Kindred	Montague	Rucker	Volgt
Kirkpatrick	Montoya	Sanders, Ind.	Volstead
Kieccka	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, Tex.	Walters
Kline, Pa.	Moore, Va.	Sandlin	Ward, N. C.
Knutson	Morgan	Schall	Wason
Kopp	Mott	Scott, Mich.	Watson
Kraus	Murphy	Scott, Tenn.	Weaver
Lampert	Nelson, A. P.	Sears	Webster
Langley	Nelson, J. M.	Shaw	White, Kans.
Lanham	Newton, Minn.	Shelton	Williams
Lankford	Norton	Sinclair	Williamson
Larsen, Ga.	O'Brien	Sinnot	Wilson
Larson, Minn.	Ogden	Smith	Wingo
Lawrence	Odfield	Smithwick	Woodruff
Lazaro	Oliver	Speaks	Woods, Va.
Leatherwood	Osborne	Steagall	Woodyard
Lee, Ga.	Overstreet	Stedman	Wright
Lineberger	Park, Ga.	Steenerson	Wurzbach
Linthicum	Parks, Ark.	Stephens	Young
Little	Parrish	Stevenson	Zihlman
Logan	Patterson, Mo.	Strong, Kans.	
London	Porter	Summers, Wash.	
Longworth	Pou	Summers, Tex.	

## NAYS—69.

Ackerman	Favrot	McArthur	Radcliffe
Bacharach	Fenn	McKenzie	Rainey, Ill.
Blanton	Freeman	MacGregor	Reber
Britten	Glynn	Madden	Riordan
Burton	Greene, Vt.	Magge	Ryan
Cable	Hicks	Martin	Sabath
Chalmers	Hill	Mason	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Hogan	Merritt	Snell
Chindblom	Houghton	Michaelson	Sproul
Connolly, Pa.	Humphreys	Mills	Stafford
Dale	Husted	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, N. J.
Deal	Jefferis	Moore, Ind.	Tilson
Dempsey	Jones, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Walsh
Dupré	King	Olp	Wheeler
Dyer	Kissel	Parker, N. J.	Yates
Edmonds	Kunz	Parker, N. Y.	
Ellis	Layton	Peters	
Faust	Leibach	Petersen	

## NOT VOTING—92.

Anderson	Funk	Lee, N. Y.	Rossdale
Ansorge	Gallivan	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Appleby	Garner	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shreve
Bird	Garrett, Tenn.	McPherson	Sisson
Bond	Gilbert	Mann	Slemp
Bowers	Good	Mead	Snyder
Brinson	Gorman	Mondell	Stiness
Browne, Wis.	Gould	Morin	Stoll
Buchanan	Graham, Pa.	Mudd	Strong, Pa.
Burdick	Hawes	Nolan	Sullivan
Byrns, Tenn.	Hukriede	O'Connor	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hutchinson	Padgett	Tinkham
Cockran	Jacoway	Paige	Towner
Codd	Kahn	Patterson, N. J.	Upshaw
Copley	Kendall	Perkins	Valle
Cramton	Kennedy	Perlman	Vare
Crowther	Kiess	Ransley	Volk
Dunn	Kinkaid	Reed, W. Va.	Ward, N. Y.
Fairchild	Kitchin	Riddick	White, Me.
Fields	Kline, N. Y.	Rodenberg	Winslow
Fish	Knight	Rogers	Wise
Free	Kreider	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Fuller	Lea, Calif.	Rosenbloom	Wyant

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. TOWNER (for) with Mr. VAILE (against).

Mr. WYANT (for) with Mr. HUTCHINSON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. MANN with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. HAWES.

Mr. APPLEBY with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. HUKRIEDE with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. SISSON.

Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. SHREVE with Mr. LEA of California.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. FREE with Mr. WISE.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. GILBERT.



Mr. PERKINS with Mr. STOLL.  
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. UPshaw.  
 Mr. VOLK with Mr. BRINSON.  
 Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. COCKRAN.  
 Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. BUCHANAN.  
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. O'CONNOR.  
 Mr. KENKAID with Mr. SULLIVAN.  
 Mr. ROGERS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. TINCHER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 2435, the emergency tariff bill, be taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and that the conference asked by the Senate be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the emergency tariff bill be taken from the Speaker's table, all the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the conference asked by the Senate agreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is but one amendment.

The SPEAKER. There is but one amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, the gentleman from North Dakota said he wanted to make a statement.

Mr. YOUNG. I was unable to understand just what objections the gentleman had—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 90.

*Resolved*, That the bill H. R. 2435, being a bill entitled "An act imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes," be, and hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, with the Senate amendment thereto, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and hereby is, disagreed to, and the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes on said amendment be, and hereby is, agreed to, and the Speaker shall immediately appoint the conferees.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution states in plain terms the purpose it has in view. Objection having been made to sending the bill to conference, the only remedy left to the House is to adopt this resolution, send the bill to conference where the differences between the House and the Senate may be compromised and agreed upon, and the legislation finally passed. If I were opposed to the bill, I would oppose sending it to conference. Being in favor of the bill, I am in favor of sending it to conference so that the differences between the House and the Senate may be agreed upon as early as possible. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the first place I wish to direct attention to the fact that this rule provides for a condition which does not exist. The rule reads that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes on said amendment be and is hereby agreed to. That is not the language of the request of the Senate, as gentlemen will see by examining the Record. They did not ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes. There had been no disagreeing votes. They asked for a conference on the bill and amendment, as I now recollect it. What sort of a situation that presents I leave for the future to determine.

In the next place, I wish to say that the Senate struck out all of Title II of the House bill and has inserted in lieu thereof Titles II, III, IV, and V as a Senate amendment. This Senate amendment deals in part with subjects entirely new, not mentioned in the House bill when it passed the House. Now it is proposed to send the bill to conference instead of to the Committee on Ways and Means. The conferees will meet. They will make up a conference report which will be returned to the House. The House will have to act upon it in advance of the Senate, and gentlemen will be confronted with the proposition of having to vote the conference report up or down as a whole, without the slightest opportunity of giving any independent consideration whatever to these new subjects that have been placed in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman states that the Senate put new subjects in the bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; the dyestuff matter was not in the House bill.

Mr. WALSH. It was placed there by way of tariff legislation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; but it is a new subject matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that it is extremely bad policy for this body which is charged under the Constitution with initiating revenue legislation to permit the Senate to place upon a House revenue bill entirely new subject matter when that subject has not had independent consideration in the House and send it to conference without giving even an opportunity for amendment. I dare say that there is not now a gentleman on the floor who is able to explain what is meant by some of the features that have been put on the bill in the Senate. Information which they derive they will derive in conference, when they call persons before them to inform them what it means. Gentlemen, that information ought to be obtained in the Committee on Ways and Means. These new subject matters ought to be brought back to the House, and the House ought to have an opportunity to consider them, and House Members should not be placed in a position of having to vote up or down the conference report as a whole without chance of amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman speaks about a number of different subject matters. There is only one, a simple provision extending the existing law to cover six months, and that is not new.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is the dyestuff title?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; it is not new legislation; it is simply extending the period of the legislation passed during the war.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was not considered in the House in connection with the tariff bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is a perfectly simple matter.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state to the House that he now understands the other provisions put on by the Senate outside of the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Indubitably. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman has no doubt as to the meaning. Does the gentleman intend to explain it to the House while discussing this rule?

Mr. LONGWORTH. When it comes back from conference.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is not a very good form of legislation. This House is charged with the duty, under the Constitution, of originating revenue legislation, and it should have the opportunity of passing upon new matters injected by the Senate under the general rules and not have to take it or reject it in a conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House what attitude was taken by the House when the Underwood tariff bill came back from the Senate and went to conference?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was sent to conference.

Mr. STAFFORD. Without having been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. It contained thousands of items in dispute, and was not sent back to the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But there was not injected into the Underwood bill a lot of new subject matters which was not in the bill before the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there was a lot of new subject matters put into the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee] seems to think that the House ought to have an opportunity to discuss the Senate amendment before it goes to the conferees. I want to remind him that he had an opportunity to-day to have as much time as he wished for the discussion of this matter. It was entirely his option to say how much time he wanted for that purpose. I want to say, further—and this is in answer to a number of questions that have been asked to-day—there is no question of bad faith involved in respect to this bill so far as the Finance Committee of the Senate is concerned. It is true that there was an understanding between the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House that it would be highly undesirable to attempt to change Title I of the bill, and that it would not be wise to attempt to add any new items to it. We were all agreed as to that. That understanding has been lived up to by the mem-

bers of the Finance Committee. There was no understanding reached as to the antidumping feature of the bill, or in any other respect except Title I of the bill.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to forget that this is an emergency bill. It is not going to do any good if we keep on considering the bill in the Ways and Means Committee until the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is entirely ready and willing that the bill should be reported out and passed. If this bill is going to do any good it ought to be passed now, not six months from now. Gentlemen who have studied this subject understand well the great emergency which exists.

At the time this bill was first discussed at the last session of Congress there was about a two years' supply of wool on hand in the United States. Wool has been coming in very fast ever since. It has been coming by the shipload. The surplus has greatly increased. Wool has become a drug on the market, so that it is absolutely impossible to sell it at any of the interior markets, and it is not possible to get a bid even at Boston, the chief market for wool. The same is largely true with respect to frozen meat, which has been coming in in tremendous quantities. That has, of course, affected the price of live stock to such an extent that it is now so low in value bankers throughout the West, who are many of them very greatly in need of the money, can not foreclose and realize enough on their mortgages to make it worth while, even if they had the disposition to do so. Wheat is coming in from Canada at the rate of almost half a million bushels a day.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I can not, as I have only five minutes. If we wait for 30 days or even 10 days this law will not do us very much good, so far as wheat is concerned. I mention this to show the highly emergent character of the legislation and the need for immediate action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the rule submitted by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], according to his explanation, is for the purpose of sending this bill to conference. I deny that that is the object of the rule. The object of this rule is to prevent the House of Representatives from considering the Senate amendment. I was surprised when the gentleman from Kansas told the House that the adoption of this rule was the only method by which you could get this bill to conference and get an agreement between the two Houses. The gentleman from Kansas shakes his head, but he did make the statement, and if he permits his statement to stay in the RECORD as he delivered it it will show that that is just what he did say.

Gentlemen of the House, let me show you what you are doing by this rule. You are sending a bill to conference that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the chairman of the committee, knows absolutely nothing about, and that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is in charge of the bill, knows nothing about. There is not a man on the floor of the House, not a single one—and I challenge him if there is, to rise in his place—who can give an explanation of what the Senate amendment provides. You have an opportunity to consider the bill; you have an opportunity to amend it, if you will, under the rules of the House. You can send it to the Ways and Means Committee and bring it back into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and consider it under the 5-minute rule, and have an opportunity to amend it or perfect it, if you desire. Why do you take that privilege away from yourselves? Why do you deny yourselves the right to legislate intelligently in the House of Representatives, when you can do it just as easily and almost as quickly as you can under this rule? You have a majority of 170. Suppose the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. FORDNEY] should let this bill go to the Committee on Ways and Means, as it would under the rules of the House. These are your rules, and they are good rules. Let it go to the Committee on Ways and Means, and within an hour from this moment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] can report this bill back to the House of Representatives, and to-morrow morning you could go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill, and consider it under the 5-minute rule, and perfect the Senate amendment, if you choose to do so. That is one way to rapidly consider the legislation, and consider it intelligently.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How frequently has it happened in the gentleman's experience that a bill goes to conference in any other way except either by unanimous consent or under a rule?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, the gentleman from Ohio talks about how frequently this is done. We have ceased to legislate here in the House of Representatives under the rules of the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman cite me an instance during the eight years when his party was in power where any bill went to conference except by unanimous consent or under a rule?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, we carried our bills to conference either by unanimous consent or by going back to the committee, except in certain instances, but we did it under the rules of the House in all tariff legislation. In the Underwood bill we sent it back. I remarked to the venerable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] this morning something which I think all will recognize as a truism. I said, "Uncle Joe, in the days of yourself and John Dalzell you were pikers compared with what they do to-day with reference to special rules." I remember when the gentleman from Illinois occupied the chair and he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell, would resolve to do so and so and bring in a special rule, but I venture the assertion now that he did not bring in 25 per cent of the number of special rules in order to consider legislation that you do to-day. Why can you not consider legislation under the general rules of the House? Most of the legislation here is considered either by unanimous consent or under a special rule.

What does this bill do, this sacred bill, in which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] said we must not cross a "t" or dot an "i" when we were considering it in the House? Some of you gentlemen thought it ought to be amended, but he appealed to you over on that side, and said there was a gentleman's agreement; that the Senate had agreed if we would not amend this bill it would be passed just exactly as we passed it. "I have agreed that we will not amend this bill, and therefore I want my Republican colleagues to keep that agreement." You did keep it, and what happened? It does not seem that a gentleman's agreement holds as good in another body as in this. They struck out 10 pages of the Young tariff bill and substituted the Senate's 18 pages. They not only did that, but inserted new matter proposed to extend a law that is an existing law, still on the statute books. Why, the dyestuffs law is still on the statute books, Mr. LONGWORTH, and why do you want to extend it for six months longer when it is already on the statute books?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is completely misinformed. That is not the dye law at all; it has nothing to do with the dye law.

Mr. GARNER. I understand it is not the dye law, but it is an embargo to be placed on the dye business now existing in the law.

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; it is a law which authorizes—

Mr. GARNER. What law?

Mr. LONGWORTH. In regard to the War Trade Board.

Mr. GARNER. The amendment of the Senate abolishes the War Trade Board and transfers its activities to the Treasury Department and prolongs its life six months. The War Trade Board is not dead yet.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It will die on the 1st of July.

Mr. GARNER. It is going to extend its life beyond the 1st of July. Now you propose to extend it for six months and transfer the activities from the War Trade Board to the Treasury Department.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman opposed to that provision?

Mr. GARNER. I want to hear some argument in reference to it. The gentleman from Ohio does not want to get any information about the matter; he does not want it to go to the Committee on Ways and Means and send for Treasury officials, send for the board of appraisers, send for members of the Tariff Commission, send for men who know something about this matter and consider it intelligently, and in that way report it back to the House, in order to give some information about the matter. Here is what you are doing: You younger Republican Members do not amount to anything. At least I think you are coming to that conclusion from the expressions of some of you, and probably you do not. You are a cog, however, in this machine. You vote away your right to amend by adopting this rule. You would have the right under the rules of the House to offer an amendment to this if it were considered under the rules of the House. You are going to take that away from yourselves to-day by adopting a special rule, and so you are not going to give yourselves the humble privilege of even offering an amendment to a bill pending in the House of Representatives. Why, you can not expect to get out of the hands of the organization and ever assert yourself in the House of Representatives and impress upon your constituency or the House itself whether you are worthy to sit here or not if you are going to sit dumbly by and permit the organization or permit the gentleman from



Kansas and the gentleman from Michigan and a few other Members to tell you just what you shall and shall not do. The quicker you begin to assert yourselves in the House of Representatives and assert your rights under the rules of the House the better it will be for you and the country, in my judgment, and for that reason I appeal to you to-day to vote down this rule and consider this bill under the rules of the House and offer amendments, if you think it ought to be amended. Are you willing to say this is perfection? It may be; it may be that after due consideration of the matter we would want to concur in the Senate amendment. Now, if we did, why do you take away from yourselves the right to do it? Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of fiscal legislation which indicates the policy which the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Michigan propose to follow. I am just wondering if the gentleman from Michigan, when he brings in his tariff bill, intends to pass it under the rules of the House or under a special rule furnished by the gentleman from Kansas. I see the gentleman from Michigan smile, but I would like to know what is in his mind. However, he declines to respond. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell the gentleman in a minute.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a tariff bill sent to conference that I can remember since I have been a Member of this House that did not carry some important new measure to be settled in conference. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] states that this is a new provision in this bill which provides in reference to the licensing board in regard to dyestuffs. Last year this House, after extended debate on the dyestuff bill, known as the Longworth bill, carried a provision almost identical with the one provided for by the Senate in this bill, and if I am fortunate enough to be one of the conferees who take up the consideration of this bill I am going to go over there and stand by the House provision. I believe that the provisions added to this bill by the Senate relating to the antidumping bill are wholly ineffective and in many instances unconstitutional. [Applause.] The gentleman well knows that this question has been before the House and fairly aired. But the gentleman says, "Oh, yes; there are a large number of new Members here." But let me call his attention to the fact that they are all Republicans. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And they know a good thing when they see it. They have confidence in the conferees. The provision written in this law as to antidumping is in substance the same as the antidumping provision in the act of 1913, known as the Underwood tariff law, which never was intended to be put in operation. There never has been one single instance in which an attempt has been made to enforce its provision, because under the provisions of that law a conspiracy must be proven between the foreign exporter and the importer.

That is impossible, and the men who wrote the law knew it. Gentlemen, this antidumping provision which we added to the bill is absolutely necessary. Only the day before yesterday both Great Britain and Canada adopted such a provision. The resolutions had been offered before, and under their law such resolutions become effective the minute they are introduced. They may be changed under the English or Canadian law, and the rates raised or lowered. Great Britain added 3½ per cent duty, and Canada in her provision makes a rate not of 66½ per cent, as we did to overcome the depreciated currency, but fixed it at 50 per cent. That is much more drastic than the provision in the bill that is now going to conference.

I do not wish to take up much time of the House. Personally I do not agree with the Senate amendment, and for that reason I want the bill to go to conference. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], one of the best fellows on earth—though nobody but myself knows it [laughter]—knew he was going to object to unanimous consent. He told me so. And the only way to get this bill to conference to-day was by this rule; and, you rascal, you know it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I desire to use the five minutes that have been allotted to me for the purpose of making a statement to the House relative to the Record, which I think will be satisfactory to every Member here, and I hope that no one will object.

As many of you know, for several months I have exercised my own prerogative by objecting to certain extensions which were sought for the purpose of printing speeches in the Record

not made on the floor of the House. At the time I did this I thought the Record needed some attention, and I wish to say to the Members of the House that the motives which prompted me were of the highest, and that I never at any time sought to show any partiality to either a Democrat or a Republican.

A few days ago the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who has charge of this bill, was generous enough to refer to my work in this connection, using the following language:

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to do so, I wish to say that I believe we have had the most accurate record of the debates and proceedings during the past few months of any time during the past eight years, and it has been due to the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] has insisted that the record kept here must be a record of what is actually said and done. I really think it is worth while to have it kept that way. As far as I am concerned, I feel as though the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] ought to be complimented for taking it upon himself to see that the record of this House is kept in that way.

I appreciate very much his kind statements. And I want to say this to the House, that I find it is practically impossible to look after one's duties in connection with the various departments and be present during the consideration of every piece of legislation. I do not wish any Member to ever say that I kept some Representative from having a privilege when another person obtained it at a time when I was not present. So I want to say to the membership of this House that I feel you are to be congratulated for the splendid cooperation you have given me in the past, and I hope that it will not be necessary at any time in the future for me to again interpose an objection to any request that may be made by any Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, answering the violent objections that have just been made to this rule, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is rather regrettable, I think, that we are forced to invoke a rule to send this bill to conference. We had hoped it would go there in the ordinary way, by unanimous consent. Any other method, any objection to unanimous consent, simply serves to delay this emergency legislation a little longer. We have delayed it too long already, gentlemen of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] This bill ought to have been passed four months ago, and would have been had it not been for a veto by the then occupant of the White House. It ought to have passed both this House and the Senate a month ago, notwithstanding the veto, had it not been for what I will not call obstructive tactics, but, at any rate, unreasonable delay.

I regret also that my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] should have brought politics into this matter. There is no politics in the only portion of the bill which is still left open to conference. One of the titles was adopted unanimously, practically, in the Senate, and this provision that both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] are raising such a hullabaloo about, namely, the extension of the power to prevent the unlimited importation of German dyes, received 13 Democratic votes in the Senate. Among them there was no less a person than the late chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator SIMMONS, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas I will read the remarks of that great Democratic leader upon this point. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] said with regard to the so-called dye paragraph:

Mr. President, I think it is the sense of this country that we have not yet reached that point in the development of the dye industry in this country where it is able adequately to meet the requirements of preparedness in case of war; so that, as I regard it and as I think it ought to be regarded, this is a mere extension of a provision necessary to the national defense until we can have reasonable time to develop that industry to the point of making it adequate to supply our demands in case of hostilities between this country and some other country in the world. It is important that we are prepared for all eventualities and that we propose to continue that state of preparedness.

I commend that to the attention of gentlemen upon that side of the House. Why, even our late colleague, the Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, voted for this, and yet you bring a question of party politics into it.

This is a very simple proposition. There are two points of difference only between the House and the Senate. The Senate has redrafted the antidumping provision of the law, for which a few years ago every single Democrat in this House voted. It is simply a question of accommodating differences, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and other members of the Ways and Means Committee could delay this thing for weeks by sending for various alleged authorities from the Treasury and other departments in order to do what the conferees can very well do, and what I believe they can do in a very few hours.

So far as the so-called dye provision is concerned, all it does is to extend the present powers of the War Trade Board, which expire either on the passage of the Knox resolution or some similar resolution, declaring peace with Germany, or would expire on the 1st of July because of lack of appropriations. It does not change a particle a law which I believe was passed unanimously in this House, and carried in one of the preparedness bills. And that is all we have to do in conference, either to determine to leave it in our bill or to leave it out. Any other method than the one we are pursuing to-day, gentlemen, is simply to delay the passage of this emergency legislation. And I submit there is not a man on this side of the House, and there ought not to be a man on that, who will be opposed to sending this bill at once to conference and getting rid of this proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] give his attention to this dyestuff and chemical provision, because in my opinion it should be unanimously approved by the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this provision in the emergency tariff bill concerning dyestuffs and chemicals is recognition of the fact that we are on the verge of a new age. We have had the stone age and the iron age and are now in the electrical age. Just ahead is the chemical age, and with an enlightened policy America will be the leader of the world in its accomplishments.

Coal tar is the most important basic material in the chemical world. In my own district for many years countless tons of coal tar from the old-style beehive coke ovens were wasted. Then it was discovered to be one of the most valuable products in the world.

Now, in the new ovens it is being conserved and used for a thousand uses. Coal tar is the essence of the forests of by-gone years. It is one of the strategic products for war and peace. It wounds and heals. It supplies both munitions and medicines.

Every ton of coal produces 120 pounds of tar. Out of the tar come 10 crude oils, which are converted into 300 secondary products or "intermediates." Through combination of these chemical elements many thousand products are possible. There are to-day at least a thousand separate dyes produced from coal tar.

The entire business has been dominated by Germany. The man who first made a dye from coal tar was an English chemist. In less than two years Germany had a complete monopoly of its production.

When the war broke out we were importing nine-tenths of our dyes from Germany. Only seven firms and 528 persons were employed in the dye industry in the United States. Cut off from our supply by the war, we suffered greatly. I saw the effect in the publishing business, when the manufacturers of printing ink found it impossible to make a satisfactory ink without the German materials. Many other lines of business suffered.

But over and above all was the fact that the dye business and the high-explosive business are the same. From the same coal tar comes picric acid, used in munitions. Within 24 hours it is possible to turn a dye plant into a munitions plant. Germany did that very thing, and, having a monopoly of the dye industry, she had a monopoly of high explosives until American energy and ability overcame all handicaps.

To-day we have 184 concerns engaged in this industry. In my district and elsewhere are young, alert, efficient business men engaged in this new line. They can compete with Du Ponts, but they can not compete with Germany. Without assistance they will be stifled under an avalanche of German goods, made by those who know that control of this industry means to dominate the age of chemistry, with all that means both in peace and war.

I believe this section of the emergency tariff bill to be the best in it. I am glad the Senate added it to the measure as it left the House, and I hope the conferees will agree to it, so that America may be independent of any other country in this most strategic industry. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to tender my congratulations to my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who made some remarks on this conference report, on the ease with which he has turned a political somersault during the progress of this legislation. There was a time when the gentleman from Texas

was enthusiastically in favor of this bill. Now it seems he is equally positive that it should be delayed and not passed.

He says he wants information. Information about what? Does he want information about the antidumping provision, that we have been discussing here for 10 years or more? Does he want information about this license system on dyes, which we discussed for days at a previous session, in which discussions the gentleman, if I remember rightly, took part? No. What the gentleman from Texas wants and what he is trying to do is to delay the passage of this bill, too long delayed already; so long delayed, indeed, that I fear it will not be able to meet the emergency now upon us, when every day increases the urgency and the necessity for its passage. But, gentlemen of the House, we on the Republican side, recognizing its necessity, intend to put it through as rapidly as possible. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, after the illuminating contributions that have been made to this discussion by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] upon the details of this Senate amendment, it may seem somewhat presumptuous to insist on the House further maintaining its proper dignity and its rights in regard to revenue legislation. But nevertheless there are a few of us, a small band, but a Spartan band [laughter], that still insist upon the maintenance of those rights and the assertion of the dignity of the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I called attention in the opening of this very vigorous debate to the fact that the Senate had struck out Title II of the House bill and had inserted as one amendment four titles. All that the House had in the bill, other than tariff features, the Senate has materially changed, and then, in addition to changing that, the Senate has added this new dyestuff matter, concerning which my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] talked so eloquently, and concerning which another friend of mine, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], on a former occasion had a few remarks to make. I do not know how Mr. FESS feels about the matter now. My recollection is that he then denounced the dye proposition as wholly indefensible and outrageous. It may be that it is to prevent the gentleman from Ohio from having the opportunity of exposing what he conceives to be the iniquities of this dye provision as contained in the bill under the 5-minute rule in the House that it has been determined to send this matter to conference and have the conferees buck and gag and tie him up on it as a party proposition and place him in the position where he is bound to vote for that which he denounced as evil in order to secure other provisions of the bill. I say perhaps in view of the great prominence of the gentleman from Ohio that may be one of the principal reasons why this ruthless, cruel, brutal majority has determined to drive this thing through in this outrageous manner. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everybody has been impressed with the sincere, high-minded, but persistent opposition to this rule that the debate has thus far evidenced.

However, I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] on his closing remarks as being the only statement made on that side that approached real debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me in order to allow me to read the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] concerning this bill on a former occasion?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If I had the time I would be glad to yield, but I fear I have not the time. [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, I am still anxious to get this bill into conference, and anxious to get it to a final vote in both the House and the Senate.

Before asking for a vote on the resolution, I move to amend by striking out the words "on the disagreeing votes," in lines 10 and 11.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Page 1, line 10, after the word "Senate," strike out the words "on the disagreeing votes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, it will read:

The conference requested by the Senate on said amendment be, and hereby is, agreed to.



Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What will be the effect of agreeing to the resolution in that form? What will be the power of the conferees?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The power of the conferees will be this, that the bill—

Be, and hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, with the Senate amendment thereto—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know how it will read.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas (reading)—

to the end that the Senate amendment be, and hereby is, disagreed to, and the conference requested by the Senate on said amendment be, and hereby is, agreed to.

The amendment of the Senate is the matter upon which the conferees will have to act.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I will read the motion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] in sending the matter to conference. The motion is—

That the Senate ask for a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendment.

That is the form of the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I directed attention to that in the beginning, I believe.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am indebted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] for calling my attention to the matter that I have just corrected by way of an amendment to the resolution. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of no quorum present. It is clear that there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. As many as are in favor of agreeing to the resolution will, as their names are called, vote "yea," those opposed "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 232, nays 98, not voting 100, as follows:

## YEAS—232.

Ackerman	Dyer	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson, J. M.
Andrews	Echols	Ketcham	Newton, Mo.
Arentz	Edmonds	King	Norton
Atkeson	Elliott	Kirkpatrick	Ogden
Bacharach	Elston	Kissel	Olpp
Barbour	Evans	Klecza	Osborne
Beck	Fairfield	Kline, N. Y.	Parker, N. J.
Beedy	Faust	Kline, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.
Begg	Favrot	Knutson	Parrish
Benham	Fenn	Kopp	Patterson, Mo.
Bixler	Fess	Kraus	Peters
Blakeney	Fitzgerald	Lampert	Petersen
Bland, Ind.	Focht	Langley	Porter
Blanton	Fordney	Lankford	Pringle
Boles	Foster	Larson, Minn.	Purnell
Brennan	Frear	Lawrence	Radcliffe
Brooks, Ill.	Freeman	Layton	Ramsayer
Brooks, Pa.	French	Lazaro	Reavis
Brown, Tenn.	Frothingham	Lea, Calif.	Reece
Burke	Gensman	Leatherwood	Reed, N. Y.
Burroughs	Gerner	Lehbach	Rhodes
Burness	Glynn	Lineberger	Ricketts
Butler	Good	Little	Riddick
Cable	Goodykoontz	Longworth	Roach
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	Luce	Robertson
Campbell, Pa.	Green, Iowa	McArthur	Rodenberg
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	McCormick	Ryan
Chalmers	Griest	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	McKenzie	Schall
Chindblom	Hardy, Colo.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott, Mich.
Christopherson	Hawley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scott, Tenn.
Clague	Hays	MacGregor	Shaw
Clarke, N. Y.	Herrick	Madden	Shelton
Clouse	Hersey	Magee	Siegel
Cole	Hickey	Maloney	Sinclair
Colton	Hicks	Mansfield	Sinnott
Connell	Hill	Mapes	Smith
Connolly, Pa.	Himes	Martin	Smithwick
Cooper, Ohio	Hoch	Merritt	Snell
Cooper, Wis.	Hogan	Michaelson	Speaks
Crowther	Houghton	Michener	Sproul
Curry	Hudspeth	Miller	Stafford
Dallinger	Hull	Mills	Steenerson
Darrow	Husted	Millsbaugh	Stephens
Davis, Minn.	Ireland	Montoya	Strong, Kans.
Deal	James, Mich.	Moore, Ill.	Summers, Wash.
Dempsey	Jeffers	Moore, Ohio	Sweet
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ind.	Swing
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan	Taylor, N. J.
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Dunbar	Jones, Tex.	Murphy	Temple
Dupré	Kearns	Nelson, A. P.	Thompson

Tilson  
Timberlake  
Tinch  
Treadway  
Underhill  
Vare

Vestal  
Voigt  
Volk  
Volstead  
Walsh  
Walters

Wason  
Watson  
Webster  
Wheeler  
Logan  
White, Kans.  
Williams

Williamson  
Wood, Ind.  
Woodyard  
Wurzbach  
Young  
Zihlman

## NAYS—98.

Almon	Drane	Larsen, Ga.	Rouse
Aswell	Drewry	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Bankhead	Driver	Linthicum	Sabath
Barkley	Fisher	Logan	Sanders, Tex.
Bell	Flood	London	Sandlin
Black	Fulmer	Lowrey	Sears
Bland, Va.	Garner	Lyon	Steagall
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	McClintic	Stedman
Box	Garrett, Tex.	McDuffie	Stevenson
Brand	Goldsborough	McSwain	Summers, Tex.
Briggs	Griffin	Montague	Swank
Bulwinkle	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Tex.	O'Brien	Ten Eyck
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Oldfield	Thomas
Cantrill	Hawes	Oliver	Tillman
Carew	Huddleston	Padgett	Tyson
Carter	Humphreys	Parks, Ark.	Vinson
Collier	James, Va.	Pou	Ward, N. C.
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Quin	Weaver
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	Rainey, Ala.	Wilson
Crisp	Keller	Rainey, Ill.	Wingo
Cullen	Kincheloe	Raker	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Kindred	Rankin	Wright
Dominick	Kunz	Rayburn	
Doughton	Lanham	Rlordan	

## NOT VOTING—100.

Anderson	Fields	Kreider	Rogers
Ansorge	Fish	Lee, N. Y.	Rose
Anthony	Free	Lufkin	Rosenbloom
Appleby	Fuller	Luhning	Rossdale
Bird	Funk	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.
Bond	Gahn	McPherson	Shreve
Bowers	Gallivan	Mann	Sisson
Brinson	Gilbert	Mason	Slomp
Britten	Go. man	Mead	Snyder
Browne, Wis.	Gould	Mondell	Stiness
Buchanan	Graham, Pa.	Morin	Stoll
Burdick	Greene, Vt.	Mudd	Strong, Pa.
Burton	Haugen	Newton, Minn.	Sullivan
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayden	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Fla.	Hukriede	O'Connor	Tinkham
Classon	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Towner
Cockran	Jacoway	Paige	Upshaw
Cold	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Vaile
Copley	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Coughlin	Kendall	Perkins	White, Me.
Cramton	Kennedy	Perlman	Winslow
Dale	Kless	Ransley	Wise
Dunn	Kinkaid	Reber	Woodruff
Ellis	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	Wyant
Fairchild	Knight	Robison	Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. WINSLOW (for) with Mr. COCKRAN (against).  
Mr. LUFKIN (for) with Mr. SULLIVAN (against).  
Mr. HUKRIEDE (for) with Mr. GALLIVAN (against).  
Mr. ROSE (for) with Mr. KITCHIN (against).  
Mr. PAIGE (for) with Mr. FIELDS (against).  
Mr. REBER (for) with Mr. SISSON (against).  
Mr. WYANT (for) with Mr. BUCHANAN (against).  
Mr. WOODRUFF (for) with Mr. GILBERT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BRINSON.  
Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin with Mr. HAYDEN.  
Mr. FISH with Mr. WISE.  
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. OVERSTREET.  
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. UPSHAW.  
Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.  
Mr. MONDELL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.  
Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey with Mr. STOLL.  
Mr. TOWNER with Mr. JACOWAY.  
Mr. MUDD with Mr. PARK of Georgia.  
Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNOR.  
Mr. MORIN with Mr. MEAD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOWELL). Without objection, the Chair will appoint the following conferees.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the names of the conferees, as follows:

Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. LONGWORTH, Mr. GARNER, and Mr. COLLIER.

## IMMIGRATION—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4075, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That as used in this act—

"The term 'United States' means the United States, and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens.

"The word 'alien' includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

"The term 'immigration act' means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled 'An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States'; and the term 'immigration laws' includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

"Sec. 2. (a) That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910. This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act: (1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) aliens in continuous transit through the United States; (3) aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (4) aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure; (5) aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration; (6) aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act; (7) aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands; or (8) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States.

"(b) For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

"(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act. In case of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting (1) in the creation of new countries, the governments of which are recognized by the United States, or (2) in the transfer of territory from one country to another, such transfer being recognized by the United States, such officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910 who were born within the area included in such new countries or in such territory so transferred, and revise the population basis as to each country involved in such change of political boundary. For the purpose of such revision and for the purposes of this act generally aliens born in the area included in any such new country shall be considered as having been born in such country, and aliens born in any territory so transferred shall be considered as having been born in the country to which such territory was transferred.

"(d) When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year, shall be excluded: *Provided*, That

the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad, aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, aliens belonging to any recognized learned profession, or aliens employed as domestic servants, may, if otherwise admissible, be admitted notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of the same nationality admissible in the same month or fiscal year, as the case may be, shall have entered the United States; but aliens of the classes included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall (unless excluded by subdivision (a) from being counted) be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act: *Provided further*, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées, (1) of citizens of the United States, (2) of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law, or (3) of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and have been separated from such forces under honorable conditions.

"Sec. 3. That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect. He shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted to the United States between the date this act becomes effective and the end of the current fiscal year, and on June 30 thereafter he shall publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted during the ensuing fiscal year. He shall also publish monthly statements during the time this act remains in force showing the number of aliens of each nationality already admitted during the then current fiscal year and the number who may be admitted under the provisions of this act during the remainder of such year, but when 75 per cent of the maximum number of any nationality admissible during the fiscal year shall have been admitted such statements shall be issued weekly thereafter. All statements shall be made available for general publication and shall be mailed to all transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States who shall request the same and shall file with the Department of Labor the address to which such statements shall be sent. The Secretary of Labor shall also submit such statements to the Secretary of State, who shall transmit the information contained therein to the proper diplomatic and consular officials of the United States, which officials shall make the same available to persons intending to emigrate to the United States and to others who may apply.

"Sec. 4. That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

"Sec. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced 15 days after its enactment (except secs. 1 and 3 and subdivisions (b) and (c) of sec. 2, which shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this act) and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted during the remaining period of the current fiscal year, from the date when this act becomes effective to June 30, shall be limited in proportion to the number admissible during the fiscal year 1922."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALBERT JOHNSON,

J. WILL TAYLOR,

JOHN E. RAKER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

LEBACON B. COLT,

WM. P. DILLINGHAM,

WILLIAM H. KING,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4075) to provide for the protection of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action



agreed upon by the conferees and submitted in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amended the House bill by substituting a different text. The action of the conferees brings to the House the original text of H. R. 4075, with three modifications, and a change with reference to the date when the act is to be effective. The changes in the House text may be stated as follows:

(1) The House provision exempting from the 3 per cent limitation aliens residing in the United States who return from a temporary visit abroad is eliminated. This classification is transferred to paragraph (d) of section 2, so that aliens who return from a temporary visit abroad are counted in making up the 3 per cent limit, but may be admitted after such limit is reached.

(2) The provision exempting aliens entitled to readmission under the provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces," approved October 19, 1918, is eliminated. Under the resolution of March 3, 1921, aliens coming under the provisions of the act of October 19, 1918, have one year from March 3, 1921, in which to make application to return to the United States, and under this bill will be subject to the percentage restriction.

(3) The following provision of the House bill is eliminated:

Aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are actually subjects of religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States solely to avoid the suffering and hardship involved in such persecution.

(4) Other changes affect the date when the act shall take effect. In lieu of May 10, 1921, as proposed in the House bill, the text of the Senate provision, providing that the act shall take effect 15 days after its enactment, is adopted.

The elimination of the provisions mentioned above makes H. R. 4075 more rigid in its restrictive effect than when it left the House.

ALBERT JOHNSON,  
J. WILL TAYLOR,  
JOHN E. RAKER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not know that anything need be said in further explanation of the bill as agreed on in conference. The statement just read recites the principal changes and also makes the affirmation that the elimination of two of the provisions of the House bill makes the bill more rigid in restriction than when it left the House. I might say that those who have followed this attempt to restrict immigration in the United States for the last two years, and even those who oppose the effort, undoubtedly have noticed that each time a bill goes through the mill it becomes a little more restrictive, and I am inclined to think that if this conference report is accepted by both branches, and if the bill is signed and becomes a law, by the time the year is up Congress will then be ready to enact something still more restrictive, and particularly with reference to the Mexican border. It has already developed that on account of this prospective legislation and on account of passport difficulties abroad, more attempts than ever are being made to surreptitiously cross the Mexican border.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Why was it not possible to make restrictions apply to Mexico in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If we start to provide for a change in the method of handling immigration on the border, we would be obliged to make actual changes in the text of the present immigration laws. The object of this particular bill is to restrict immigration to 3 per cent of the number of aliens who were in the United States in 1910. This bill makes it possible for 355,000 new immigrants to come in legally, and a few in addition under the exemptions. If we are able to hold immigration to that number for a year, the United States will have the whip hand at the ocean ports in regard to immigration. We will be able to control that number of immigrants with some degree of success, and we hope we will then have both men and money for use in the protection of the Mexican border, so that we may shut out surreptitious entries. In other words, if we can get the whip hand at Ellis Island, we will then be able to attend to the situation on the Mexican border.

It is interesting to note that in the last three months the surreptitious entry of Europeans across the Mexican border has commenced in earnest. In February there were 24 caught either in the act of entry or after the act. In March the

number of Europeans caught was 23, and in April the number reached 72, making a total of 119 from European countries, mostly men. They had all come by way of the port of Vera Cruz. Their nationalities are a matter of interest.

In February of the 24 entries there were 6 Germans, 6 Russians, 5 Austrians, the balance scattered. In March of the 23, 5 were Germans, 7 Spaniards, 5 Poles, balance scattered. April, of the 72 there were 8 Germans, 17 Russians, 8 Poles, 10 Lithuanians, 12 Italians, balance scattered.

Mr. Speaker, the situation on the Mexican border is such that if there is one caught coming in it may be put down as certain many are coming in without being caught. I have a report concerning the situation in Vera Cruz and elsewhere in Mexico that seems to indicate that a full-blown line of smuggling and of fraudulent entry is under way, full blast, in Mexico, for these various people in Europe who, unable to get passports, are now piling up in Mexico intending to come across the border into the United States. I have evidence of the efforts to assist them across the border and to prevent their deportation when they are caught. Part of the Ellis Island situation is now being transferred to the border, and we may look for more of it. As I said, it is hoped that this restrictive immigration legislation will relieve immigrant officials elsewhere and permit them to pay some attention to the Mexican border.

Since April 2 five vessels have arrived at Vera Cruz from European ports and have landed more than 500 European immigrants. Apparently Mexico bars none from entry for any cause. But if the moving population of Europe is to be dumped into Mexico, that is Mexico's affair, not ours. It will be our business to prevent such immigrants from crossing the border. It will be our business to shut down on the loose giving of bond for entry, of which I have already some evidence. The situation on the Canadian border is different, owing to our arrangements for our protection with steamship companies landing immigrants at Canadian ports for entry to the United States. We have no such agreements with any steamship lines running to Mexican ports.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the 355,000 which the gentleman mentioned include Germans who may come in?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Forty thousand of them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Probably 75,000, if that many desire to come and can secure passports.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for two short questions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. MILLER. Under section 4 the provisions of this act are in addition to and not supplemental to the present laws?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. And it defines what the immigration laws are. What I want to ask the gentleman is, under the treaty or under the law now relating to the exclusion of Asiatic laborers, there is an exemption clause that traders or merchants coming to the country and doing business have a right to come and live here. Does this act in any way affect that class?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It does not. That is why the fifth exemption is in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the clause exempting those fleeing from religious persecution has been dropped. The vote in the Senate was about 4 to 1 against such a clause. I might call attention to the fact that one of the principal changes is in regard to aliens returning from temporary visits abroad. All should bear in mind that aliens legally in the United States and going abroad during this law may return from a temporary visit. The provisions in this bill protect them so that if they return they may be counted within the 3 per cent, but if the 3 per cent is exhausted they may still return without being counted. Each one who returns, within the 3 per cent, will mean one less new immigrant, that is all. At one time we thought we might permit returns of those without counting them at all, but statistics for the last year show that about 120,000 went out and returned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. What limitation is put on the time for them to return?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Six months. A temporary visit is held to be six months. To have permitted that possible number or anyone to go out and return without being counted would have been a considerable liberalizing of the restrictive plan.

The provision under the joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of aliens who have been conscripted or who have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or the cobelligerent forces has been eliminated for the reason that the few now out who are likely to



desire to return may come in along with the 3 per cent. The legislation which was enacted last March, which served as an act terminating war activities, terminated that return cobelligerent soldier act. But that act gave one year in which they may return, and they still have that right for nine months from the time this would go into effect. Further, all who went out and fought with the Allies or with the cobelligerent forces have had to date something like two years and a half in which to return, which would seem to be about long enough.

The other change affects the date. The Senate made the bill effective 15 days after its enactment for the small fraction of time remaining from now until the beginning of the calendar year, and then for one year beginning July 1. We have accepted that. Otherwise the text is that of the House bill 4075.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SABATH. Under the provision which the gentleman has mentioned, namely, the permission to those who served with the cobelligerent armies to return under the resolution that we passed, I think, on March 3, 1921—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Granting them the right to return under the provisions of that act, they will no longer have that right if the 3 per cent will have been reached. They can not then return?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They can return, if inside the 3 per cent limit; but it must be perfectly clear to the gentleman that they have had two years and a half in which to get back. The exemption which we gave them at that time in order to let them come back excused them from all the provisions of the immigration laws; it let them be physically defective, contract laborers, stowaways, illiterate, crippled, and so forth. In other words, regardless of their condition, mentally or physically, generously we gave them that time and waived the law; and if any of them have stayed out more than two years and a half I think we may well assume that they do not care now to return to the United States as a privileged class.

Mr. SABATH. Then you nullify the act of March 3, 1921.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not for those who may come within the 3 per cent.

Mr. SABATH. Then the gentleman thinks that those who fought for our country and are still over there should have no right to come back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Our soldiers, alien and otherwise, are either back or still in the army of occupation. How long would the gentleman like to have a few cobelligerents stay over there and still hold the right to return to the United States? They have had over two years and a half as it is. They may be in the armies of other countries. The time has come for complete allegiance, so far as the United States is concerned, and not for dual allegiance or dual citizenship, or for special privileges for the alien not even within the borders of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 15 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman begins, will he yield to me, to submit a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. RAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERNERD] may have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD upon this report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have the right to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the right to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes of that time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the chairman of the committee has called attention to the fact that certain portions of our border are not properly guarded, and

that aliens are coming in unlawfully. That is a much more serious matter than is generally understood. The testimony before our committee was that last year some hundred thousand or more had come across the Texas border in that way. Investigation conducted by the committee convinced the committee—that and information coming to me from many sources fully convinces me—that not only people from Mexico and Canada, who are not admissible under our immigration laws, are coming in, but that people of other countries in great numbers are slipping into the United States in that way. Now that we are tightening the restrictions and trying to partially dam the stream, so to speak, the pressure at the weak points will be greater. There will be great numbers of Germans, Russians, Poles, and others coming in. Many Japanese now are coming into California and that portion of the country through both Mexico and Canada. I say these things in the hope of drawing the attention of the Members of the House to this important part of our immigration problem. Any law is futile if it is not enforced. It is effective just to the extent that it is properly enforced. It is idle for us to consume time in enacting restrictive measures and then take no effective steps to enforce them. I take this limited time to call the matter to the attention of the House in the hope that it will receive serious consideration. I think the committee will give it attention. I hope that those who control legislation here will give it such consideration that when these measures looking to better enforcement of the law are brought forward for action they will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was under consideration I read into the RECORD a telegram from Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, a distinguished rabbi of the city of Baltimore, advocating the passage of the bill. Since the amendment of the bill by the Senate the rabbi has wired me again and requested that I give this telegram the same publicity as the other. In order to do that I take this opportunity to read the telegram, which is as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., May 4, 1921.

Representative J. CHARLES LINTHICUM,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I note with regret that the immigration bill has passed the Senate minus the mitigating and just provisions for religious and political refugees and the reunion of families, which provisions were contained in the bill when I voiced my approval of it and as it passed the House. The situation, therefore, has changed and I can not in justice let the impression pass that I favor unqualified restrictions. I say this not only as a Jew who suffers in his brethren's sufferings but as an American who is loath to see his country depart from its humanitarian policy of offering a haven to those in dire need. May I ask you to give this statement the same publicity which was given the previous one.

Rabbi MORRIS S. LAZARON.

Personally I am as ever strongly in favor of this bill and the restriction of immigration.

The time is at hand when America must first assimilate those who have already entered our borders, must first find work for those of our own citizenship and see to it that America is first for Americans; that American principles and doctrines must prevail; that the Constitution and those things for which America stands must prevail.

I hope the bill will soon be agreed upon and approved. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Has any time been fixed for debate upon the conference report?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington had one hour within which to move the previous question. If he does not move the previous question within that time, the Chair will recognize some one else for another hour.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman intends to move the previous question before the expiration of the hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I trust considerably within the hour. I am yielding the gentleman from California 15 minutes now, and I have some time to yield on this side.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the present time might I be permitted to ask the gentleman from Washington one question?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield to me a little time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would it not be better for the gentleman from California to control the remaining part of his 15 minutes by using it and I will reserve the floor?



Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the conferees judged the sentiment of the House as well as that of the Senate. The bill passed the Senate with only one vote against it. It passed the House with almost a three-fourths vote. When it came down to the two contested questions, that of permitting those who had resided in the United States to come back at their will without any restrictions at all, the conferees believed that it was better to take the Senate amendment so as to count the number who had been residents of the United States and gone abroad in the 3 per cent until that limit had been exhausted and then permit them to come in following that beyond the limitation. That is some restriction. The Senate conferees felt as though the Senate was very anxious that too much delay with amendments should not be taken up because the country wants a temporary restrictive measure. And I believe that is the attitude of the House. I am speaking of the attitude on this side of the House, and my friend, the chairman, has spoken for the other side, that that is their attitude and they want a temporary restrictive measure at the present time, so we may in the meantime endeavor to modify our immigration laws to meet the demands that are so pressing and that the people over the country desire, to the end that the great number of undesirables—and I say that advisedly from the hearings and from the information—should not be permitted to come to this country. We find from the February and March, 1921, reports that 150 or more criminals tried to get in in the last two months. Some got in and were deported. You find the line running down to about 7,000 in the last two months, which includes those not admissible. You can see the extreme effort that is being made to get into this country by those who do not belong here. The farmers over this country want relief and they want it through this class of legislation. You find it in the farm journals. You find it in the editorials of those who speak from first-hand experience, and they say they do not want a foreign hoe hand, but they want a real American farmer to do their work. The next provision that created some discussion, that I think the Members of the House should know particularly about, has been very clearly presented by the chairman, and just one word on it from myself is all I desire, and that is in regard to religious persecution.

My recollection is it was attempted to amend it in the Senate by allowing the political refugees. That was defeated about 60 to 13 to show the attitude of the people. It was carried here by not a very large vote, but I believe the Members of this body really desire to restrict, and the provision as it was in the bill as it passed the House practically threw the door wide open. There is no definition as to what a refugee fleeing from religious persecution was.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. In a moment. So as a matter of fact it might have run into hundreds of thousands of those who claimed they were fleeing from religious persecution. Now, I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As I understand—and if I am mistaken the gentleman will correct me—no one can come in except they comply with our laws on immigration. This bill did not seek to extend it?

Mr. RAKER. No; this bill did not seek to extend the law which fixed the qualifications for those who desired to come in. In other words, they must not be criminals or be diseased, and various other conditions; but this provision that was in the bill as it passed the House, and as amended without, I believe, due consideration, did change that condition as to those fleeing from religious persecution.

Mr. MASON. May I ask, then, under your present bill as you propose it now, taken in connection with the visé laws and the laws of passport of this country, a man who is a political refugee and who seeks an asylum by reason of religious persecution, although he complies with every part of the immigration law, can not come in here without a passport from his king?

Mr. RAKER. He will come within the 3 per cent.

Mr. MASON. But not without a passport.

Mr. RAKER. Then when he comes within the 3 per cent and the 3 per cent has been exhausted he can not enter the United States, and he is in the same position as others, because if we had left the provision as it stood in this bill as it passed the House there would practically be no restriction. Any man could have come if he said he was fleeing from religious persecution. In other words, that he was suffering; so the bill would have been no restrictive bill at all.

Mr. MASON. As I understand it now, living under the present law, if this passes a man who complies in every particular with the law, if he wishes to come here and adopt this form of

government and likes it and renounces allegiance—I say if he comes here seeking refuge by reason of persecution for religion or politics, he can not enter here, even though he complied with all the laws, unless he has a passport from the king of his country.

Mr. RAKER. There are two answers to that, and I will answer the first. If he comes within the 3 per cent during that time he could enter into the United States. After the quota has been filled he could not. Now, going to the next question. Under the law we passed almost unanimously by the House and the Senate and approved by the President a man must have a passport. That is the law now.

Mr. MASON. That is the war law.

Mr. RAKER. No; it was the law after the armistice, but, of course, technically we are at war; but we passed it after the war, so there are two conditions. He must have a passport to come in even within the quota, and when that is exhausted he can not, and if he has no passport he can not enter.

Mr. MASON. In other words, the King of the other country determines for us who is to be allowed to come here?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. No; the American people have come to a realization that they have some control themselves.

Mr. MASON. Then you leave it to the King to say who shall come?

Mr. RAKER. We have some control as to the people who shall enter this country. Now, we are putting some restrictions on as to the number. We are hoping eventually, within the next year, that with the benefit we can get from the American people and those who have given a study of this that we will be able to put on the statute books a law which will permit some better selection of our immigrants than we have at the present time, as well as to provide for their proper distribution, so that the American people will be able to enforce such laws and determine beyond question for themselves who shall be citizens in this country. We want reasonable and proper immigration after we have had time to properly digest and assimilate what we now have with us. The new law should meet our needs and changed conditions. Within the next year we will have such a bill to present to this House.

Mr. MASON. That is what I hoped would be the law now.

Mr. RAKER. The following editorial from the Country Gentleman, of date March 19, 1921, shows the attitude of the American people on this restriction of immigration question. I insert it as part of my remarks at this time:

A steamship arriving in New York the other day brought immigrants of 17 different nationalities. None was from the British Isles or the Scandinavian countries or Holland, and of course none from Germany.

These newcomers, therefore, were far removed in speech, customs, habits of thought, and appearance from the original stock of this country. Most of them possessed little beyond the scanty sum required for admittance. Virtually all of them immediately betook themselves to the foreign "colonies" that have been established in American cities as Old World carryovers—districts already overcrowded beyond decent and healthful housing capacity, most of them already containing thousands of idle workmen.

At the time this steamship and others with like cargoes of human flotsam were coming to our shores Congress was conducting hearings on the subject of immigration. It was listening with the usual congressional gravity to the spokesmen of this, that, or another nationality, all pleading that the way of their brethren abroad into the land of promise and plenty might be free and unhampered. One observer noted, with keen perception, that "there were few spokesmen for America present."

It was admitted during the hearings that any action Congress might take at the time would be only temporary; no attempt would be made to arrive at a well-studied and sound immigration program designed to meet the greatest need and the greatest good of the country as a whole.

Yet that is exactly what we are supposed to have Congress for—to work out sound and enduring solutions for our serious national problems, such as this question of wholesale immigration has become. Failure to meet the issue squarely and decisively, one way or another, is a tacit admission of the inability or the unwillingness of Congress to handle it. The average American can find little comfort in either explanation; he can only conclude that either the caliber or the dominant motive of our national legislators has descended to a sorry level.

It has been maintained by the advocates of unrestricted immigration that some of this human overflow sooner or later will reach the agricultural sections. It has not shown any tendency in that direction yet. And what if it does? The American farmer is not likely to be able to speak Yiddish or Croatian or any of the other languages or dialects of southeast Europe. A farm hand to whom he can not explain what he wants done and how to do it is of no use to the already hurried farmer. He can not afford to keep an interpreter.

Moreover, there is a reasonable doubt whether the American farmer wants this new type of immigrant to turn to the land. Perhaps it would mean in a few years a competition geared to standards of living and working much lower than the American farmer can or will endure. California farmers have had to face some of that sort of competition; so have small southern farmers; so has more than one New England farmer. In no case has it made for contentment and progress, but has resulted in racial differences, bitterness, and quite often the departure of the old American stock from the land.

To promote the continuance and spread of such a situation is manifestly unfair to the American farmer, who already carries an ample load of difficulties. Furthermore, it is unfair to the strong-souled men



and women who pioneered and developed this country of ours. They wrought it from a wilderness and a prairie into a fair and bounteous land. But they wrought it thus for their children and children's children to possess and enjoy and build upon. To allow these pioneers' children to be dispossessed, through a competition they can not and should not meet, can hardly be described as keeping faith with the fathers.

Without doubt conditions in numerous European and Asiatic countries are deplorable. Certain peoples, likewise without doubt, are having to suffer unjust oppression and mistreatment. No person with ordinary human feelings can fail to sympathize with these unfortunate ones. But that sympathy is overdone if allowed to take the form of an unlimited ticket of admission to this country. Sentiment ever has been an unreliable substitute for good sense.

A great and revered American saw the danger of a people divided in speech and aims and beset by conflicting allegiances when he spoke out against the converting of this country into "a polyglot boarding house." He clearly discerned that the greatest service Americans could perform for mankind was the maintenance of a nation united in purpose and ideals and with an ever-rising standard of individual welfare.

As long as such a nation exists it will be a stimulus to the peoples of other lands to make their own Governments freer and more beneficent. But if we wreck our Nation by receiving an indigestible mass of foreigners, it will be neither a hope nor a haven.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was not in when the gentleman from Washington presented his conference report and made his motion, and I have been able to make only a very hasty reading of this report.

As I understand—and I will ask the gentleman if my understanding is correct—in making up the maximum under the 3 per cent limitation, alien children under the age of 18, of citizens of the United States, are not to be included?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That provision, which was placed in the House bill on the floor, is retained in the bill. The only thing that keeps the children of American citizens out—and this refers to naturalized American citizens—is that the children are abroad and have not put a foot on our soil.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I notice on page 3 this proviso:

*Provided further, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of the United States.*

Is that to apply when the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year shall have been reached? Is that the idea?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. That proviso is a matter of expressing a preference for the selection up to 3 per cent.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then, Mr. Speaker, it conflicts absolutely with the exception on page 2, in the last two lines of subparagraph (8), which says that—

Aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States—

shall not be considered at all in making up the computation of 3 per cent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; they are merely preferences within the 3 per cent.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, then there is a contradiction, if that is the interpretation the gentleman from Washington puts upon it. Paragraph (a) of section 2, on page 2, says:

*That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910.*

And then comes this language:

*This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act:*  
 \* \* \* (8) Aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States.

That language takes entirely out of the 3 per cent limitation the alien children of citizens of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And then follows that when the maximum number of any nationality shall be reached others shall be admitted and not counted. Then come the preferences. Now, while children are clearly exempted, they are still named in the preferences. It can not make any difference.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. On the contrary, I think it can. Until the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted has been reached this question of a preference arises.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is no preference. After that quota is full those who come in are those particularly exempted, and who are named as ministers, actors, lecturers, singers, nurses, and professors, and so forth. They may be

admitted notwithstanding the maximum number has been admitted and counted. Those particular limited classes are permitted without a count.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But by the proviso which I read you give to an official the power to exclude children of citizens. You say in the proviso that children of citizens of the United States may be preferentially treated. You talk in the proviso as if it was a matter of privilege instead of a matter of human right. And yet in subparagraph (8), of (a), in section 2, you expressly exempt aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is an attempt here in proposing preferential treatment for minor children of citizens of the United States not to recognize the fact that a man who is a naturalized citizen has a right to have his minor children with him in this country.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In one moment.

A man who is born a citizen of the United States has the right to have his minor children under his own roof-tree. But here is a provision which the House struck out of the original House bill, which in effect permits a representative of the United States Government in a foreign country to say that the minor children of a citizen of the United States may under certain circumstances be excluded. In other words, it is optional with him to visé or not to visé their passports. The law ought without any qualification to provide that minor children—if free from contagious disease and otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States—of citizens of the United States shall be allowed to enter, not that they shall have mere preferential treatment. An alien citizen has all the rights under the Constitution of the United States that you have who are "native and to the manner born."

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not just a little misunderstanding on the gentleman's part? Under the general law the children of a native-born citizen of the United States can come to this country wherever he is.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This provision applies to the children of citizens naturalized, living in a foreign country, and those children are not citizens until they enter the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to have two minutes to answer that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I agree most heartily with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] has said regarding the urgent necessity of providing a sufficient force on the Texas border. The entire committee has agreed to that proposition before, and has urged not only a proper force on the Mexican border but also on the Canadian border. But this committee of ours has no power to appropriate. We can recommend, we can urge, we can beg, we can beseech for the proper force, but that is about all that we can do. The troubles described by the gentleman are pretty well known to us. We went into that fully last year, and the Record is full of details showing that thousands and thousands of people crossed both borders without medical examination or any other kind of examination, and are now in Texas and other Southern States, and also in Northern States. But the responsibility does not rest with our committee.

I heard what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] said. He is correct in his interpretation, because what is being adopted here is the Senate bill. The Senate bill did not originally have the provision about aliens under the age of 18 or children of citizens of the United States as an excepted class, and therefore the proviso was inserted to the effect that preference shall be given not only to the children but also to the wives of American citizens by naturalization, who themselves are American citizens by virtue of the naturalization law. There



can be no question about that. A simple reading of the language establishes my contention.

For the first time in the history of the country we are providing here that no person, no matter how good his character may be, seeking to come here from abroad, suffering from religious persecution, under the terms of our bill as passed here, would have had to establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that he was coming here solely to escape religious persecution.

Yet under the terms of this bill as it is presented now to-day such a person can not enter the United States. The same applies so far as political refugees are concerned, and that occurs the moment your 3 per cent is reached, even though he is fit, able, and capable of becoming a full American citizen in the broadest sense of the term. The American consul on the other side says, "You are of the type we want in America, but I can not give you a passport because 3 per cent is about to be reached or has been reached."

We are controlling immigration in two ways now. The Labor Department does not control it. The State Department controls it. That department determines how many people shall obtain their visés on the other side, and its officials each month in advance know how many visés will be granted in the coming month on the other side.

There can be no dispute about that, because I put the figures in the RECORD when this bill was up last month, showing how in certain countries they had granted 245,000 visés during the year 1920 because we had a number of consulates there; the same is true of England, where we granted 89,000, and yet in another country where there had been the greatest kind of suffering as a result of the war, a country where, as Theodore Roosevelt said, the people had undergone more suffering than any other people on the face of the earth, there was granted only 44,000 visés in the entire year.

Mr. RAKER. But notwithstanding that visé there were denied admission during the last year 7,274, and those included persons afflicted with insanity and paupers and professional beggars, and those having tuberculosis, and so forth.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will admit that 7,000 were excluded, but that included those who were being deported, those whose cases were being held up here for quite a time. The Secretary of Labor and his staff are doing all they can to enforce the law strictly. I agree with them in the enforcement of the law, because that is why it is on the statute books. The gentleman's statement simply confirms what I have contended during the entire year. We should have the proper officials who desire to enforce the law, and then we will get it enforced. But that does not do away with this fact, that it is the consular officers on the other side who do determine who shall come here. Any person looking into this question thoroughly knows that to be the fact.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] is right when he says no person can come here except by the will of the Government of the particular country on the other side where he resides, because no person can enter the United States without first obtaining a passport visé from our consul, and if the Government on the other side does not desire that person to leave that country, he can not leave it without a passport.

I have prepared here the figures of 1919 and 1920, both censuses, which I read. They are as follows:

Country of birth of foreign-born white for continental United States, 1920.

	United States.	1920 <sup>1</sup>	1910
Total foreign-born white, 1920.....	13,703,987	391,120	355,461
England.....	812,414	24,378	
Scotland.....	254,482	7,634	
Wales.....	67,071	2,012	
Ireland.....	1,035,680	31,070	277,206
Norway.....	363,599	10,908	12,116
Sweden.....	624,759	18,743	19,956
Denmark.....	189,051	5,672	5,449
Belgium.....	62,648	1,879	1,482
France (including Alsace-Lorraine).....	152,792	4,584	3,523
Luxemburg.....	12,539	376	
Netherlands.....	131,262	3,937	3,624
Switzerland.....	118,647	3,559	3,745
Germany.....	1,683,298	50,499	75,040
Poland.....	1,139,578	33,187	
Austria.....	574,959	17,248	50,117
Hungary.....	397,081	11,912	
Czechoslovakia.....	359,285	10,779	
Yugoslavia.....	173,063	5,192	
Ruthenia.....	3,100	93	
Russia.....	1,398,999	41,970	51,974
Finland.....	149,671	4,490	

<sup>1</sup> Who may come—3 per cent.

<sup>2</sup> United Kingdom.

Country of birth of foreign-born white for continental United States, 1920—Continued.

	United States.	1920	1910
Lithuania.....	135,139	4,054	
Portugal.....	67,830	2,035	1,781
Spain.....	49,232	1,479	663
Italy.....	1,607,458	48,224	40,294
Greece.....	175,701	5,271	3,038
Bulgaria.....	10,486	315	345
Rumania.....	103,007	3,090	1,978
Turkey.....	5,315	159	967
Other Europe.....	11,541	346	1,792
Asia.....	110,586	3,318	
Africa.....	5,250	157	
Australia.....	10,855	327	
Canada, French.....	307,681	9,230	
Canada, other.....	809,455	24,284	
Newfoundland.....	13,239	397	
Cuba and other West Indies <sup>1</sup> .....	28,024	841	
Mexico.....	476,676	14,300	
Central America.....	4,082	122	
South America.....	16,838	505	
Atlantic Islands.....	39,003	1,170	
Pacific Islands.....	3,629	109	
Atsea.....	5,275	168	
Country not specified.....	3,657	111	

<sup>1</sup> Except Porto Rico.

Foreign-born white population of the United States: 1920, 1910, and 1900.

State.	Foreign-born white.			Increase <sup>1</sup> 1910-1920.		Increase <sup>1</sup> 1900-1910.	
	1920	1910	1900	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
United States.....	13,703,987	13,345,545	10,213,817	358,442	2.7	3,131,728	30.7
Alabama.....	17,662	18,056	14,338	-1,294	-6.8	4,618	32.2
Arizona.....	78,099	46,824	22,395	31,275	66.8	24,429	109.1
Arkansas.....	13,975	16,909	14,186	-2,934	-17.4	2,723	19.2
California.....	681,654	517,250	316,505	164,404	31.8	200,745	63.4
Colorado.....	116,954	126,851	90,475	-9,897	-7.8	36,376	40.2
Connecticut.....	376,513	328,759	237,396	47,754	14.5	91,363	38.5
Delaware.....	19,810	17,420	13,729	2,390	13.7	3,691	26.9
Dist. of Columbia.....	28,548	24,351	19,520	4,197	17.2	4,831	24.7
Florida.....	43,008	33,842	19,257	9,166	27.1	14,585	75.7
Georgia.....	16,186	15,072	12,021	1,114	7.4	3,051	25.4
Idaho.....	38,963	40,427	21,890	-1,464	-3.6	18,537	84.7
Illinois.....	1,204,403	1,202,560	964,635	1,843	.2	237,925	24.7
Indiana.....	150,868	159,322	141,861	-8,454	-5.3	17,461	12.3
Iowa.....	225,647	278,484	305,782	-47,837	-17.5	32,298	10.6
Kansas.....	110,578	135,190	126,577	-24,612	-18.2	8,613	6.8
Kentucky.....	30,780	40,053	50,133	-9,273	-23.2	10,080	20.1
Louisiana.....	44,871	51,782	51,853	-6,911	-13.3	71	.1
Maine.....	107,300	110,123	92,935	-2,833	-2.6	17,198	18.5
Maryland.....	102,148	104,174	98,144	-2,026	-1.9	11,080	11.8
Massachusetts.....	1,077,072	1,051,050	840,114	26,022	2.5	210,936	25.1
Michigan.....	726,214	595,824	540,196	130,680	21.9	55,328	10.2
Minnesota.....	485,261	543,010	504,935	-57,749	-10.6	38,075	7.5
Mississippi.....	8,019	9,289	7,625	-1,370	-14.6	1,764	23.1
Missouri.....	185,893	228,896	215,775	-43,003	-18.8	13,121	6.1
Montana.....	93,447	91,644	62,373	1,803	2.0	29,271	46.9
Nebraska.....	149,652	175,865	177,117	-26,213	-14.9	1,252	.7
Nevada.....	14,802	17,999	8,581	-3,197	-17.8	9,418	109.8
New Hampshire.....	91,154	96,558	87,961	-5,404	-5.6	8,597	9.8
New Jersey.....	738,761	658,188	430,950	69,573	12.2	228,138	53.0
New Mexico.....	29,077	22,654	13,261	6,423	28.4	9,393	70.8
New York.....	2,783,773	2,729,272	1,889,523	54,501	2.0	839,749	44.4
North Carolina.....	7,099	5,942	4,394	1,157	19.9	1,548	35.2
North Dakota.....	131,486	156,158	112,590	-24,672	-15.8	43,568	38.7
Ohio.....	678,647	597,245	457,900	81,402	13.6	139,345	30.4
Oklahoma.....	39,951	40,084	20,390	-133	-.3	19,604	96.6
Oregon.....	102,149	103,001	58,861	-852	-.8	49,140	91.2
Pennsylvania.....	1,387,298	1,438,719	982,543	-51,421	-3.6	456,176	46.4
Rhode Island.....	173,366	178,025	133,772	-4,659	-2.6	44,252	33.1
South Carolina.....	6,401	6,054	5,371	347	5.7	683	12.7
South Dakota.....	82,372	100,628	88,329	-18,256	-18.1	12,299	13.9
Tennessee.....	15,479	18,459	17,586	-2,980	-16.1	873	5.0
Texas.....	360,071	239,984	177,581	120,087	50.0	62,403	35.1
Utah.....	56,429	63,393	32,804	-6,994	-11.0	10,589	20.1
Vermont.....	44,499	49,861	44,694	-5,362	-10.8	5,167	11.6
Virginia.....	30,784	26,628	19,068	4,156	15.6	7,590	39.6
Washington.....	249,818	241,197	102,125	8,621	3.6	139,072	138.2
West Virginia.....	61,899	57,072	22,379	4,827	8.5	34,693	155.0
Wisconsin.....	459,904	512,569	515,705	-52,665	-10.2	3,136	.6
Wyoming.....	25,243	27,118	16,582	-1,875	-7.0	10,536	63.5

<sup>1</sup> A minus sign (-) denotes decrease.

<sup>2</sup> Includes population of Indian Territory for 1900.

My friend from California [Mr. RAKER], who is always very much excited in regard to immigration at all times and places, whether he is in either Washington, California, New York, or elsewhere, was horrified when I said we should use the 1920 census as a basis for our calculations. It must astonish the gentleman that it should be proposed that the 1920 census should be used. That would have shown less than 355,000 people coming into the United States. The total of foreign-born was 13,703,987, which includes Canada and Mexico. You

had approximately one million and some odd thousand from Canada, 13,000 from Newfoundland, 16,000 from Mexico, and some thousands from the South American countries. If we had taken the census of 1920 as a basis, we would have been fairer and squarer than we are by simply saying we will adopt the census of 1910. My friend from California thinks he is always right and never wrong. In this respect he is absolutely wrong, because the figures tell the other story, and I hope he will concede it this trip. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill did not have the approval of the conferees in the fullest sense of the term, but it is the only kind of legislation which, in the excitement, hysteria, and turmoil of the time, they feel they can possibly put through. The bill does not do justice, and in their hearts and souls they know it does not.

Mr. BEGG. To whom is the injustice done by this bill?

Mr. SIEGEL. Injustice is done to thousands of American boys who fought on the other side, who will not be able to bring over to this country either their parents or their small brothers and sisters.

Mr. BEGG. Does not this bill place them in the specially preferred class?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, no, for this reason: You limit the number to approximately 33,000 from Poland, when there are 55,000 requests from boys who fought for us in the World War, and by your attempted preference you force the American consuls on the other side to try to make a choice and a discrimination between soldier boys who fought for us. This is not justice, and the American people will soon say so, for they want to be fair and humane to all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I agree with the gentleman from California that there is a certain demand for this legislation, but it is due to the fact that a prejudice has been created by the professional restrictionists among people who have not studied the immigration question. I do not agree with the gentleman, however, that the farmers of this country desire this legislation, or that they are clamoring for restrictions. Just the opposite is true, because last year and even this year we have had many gentlemen here from Texas, Colorado, California, and other States, requesting, demanding, and insisting that relief be granted them, and that we should suspend the literacy test, and that we should not further restrict immigration, so that they could get enough labor to enable them properly to work and take care of their farms.

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to believe that if all of the gentlemen had studied this bill as carefully as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has, they would hesitate a long, long while before they would cast their votes for this conference report. Somehow or other no one seems to realize and appreciate how far-reaching this bill is. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] tried to the best of his ability within the seven minutes that he had to point out that you are willfully and deliberately legislating against American citizens, and that you give preference to many aliens and permit them to come but you draw the line against the American citizen. If the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] have copies of the bill before them, I wish they would turn to page 2 of the report, where they will observe that we exempt from the operation of the 3 per cent, in the first place, Government officials, and so on; in the next place, aliens who are in continuous transit through the United States; third, aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; fourth, aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure; fifth, aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration.

These classes you exempt from the 3 per cent, which means that you exempt the Japanese and the Chinese. They can come in, notwithstanding the 3 per cent, because you deliberately exempt them.

Mr. MASON. They can come in.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; they can come in. There is no limitation in this bill. Sixth, you admit aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone. Who are they that they shall be exempted? Seventh, aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands. You also exempt from the operation of the 3 per cent those who desire to come from Canada; yes, and from Mexico. But you say that the wives, the

brothers, the sisters, the fathers, and the children of American citizens can not come in after the 3 per cent has been reached.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman stopped at the end of 7 and did not read 8, and 8 permits the entrance of aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the children under 18. I stand corrected as to that. But here on page 3 you provide further that in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of the United States, of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law, or of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918. You say they shall have preference; that is, if they will make their applications within that time and before the 3 per cent limit is reached. But when the 3 per cent limit has been reached none of these people can come, while the first class that I have designated can come, notwithstanding the fact that the 3 per cent limit has been reached. Now, that is manifestly unjust and unfair. I am sure that if you gentlemen would study the bill as carefully as I and as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has studied it, and who has pointed out these defects in the bill, I know, in justice to yourselves, to these deserving men, and to our country, you could not vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], and by others that this is only a temporary measure and that within six months the committee will be ready with a permanent immigration bill, which will be more stringent than this measure. May I inquire how much further the gentleman from Washington and the other members of the committee contemplate going? Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am thoroughly familiar with the view of some of the gentlemen of the committee and I realize what their aims are and that they would not hesitate a moment to close permanently and completely our doors to immigration and build, if possible, a Chinese wall around our country.

It is to them that I wish to state that I firmly believe that this great Nation of ours will never tolerate any such foolhardy proposition. On the contrary, in lieu of them bringing in a more stringent bill than this they will be compelled by public opinion, long before this act expires, to repeal it and to bring in a fair and humane immigration bill, because the American people will shortly realize that Congress and others clamoring for this legislation have been imposed upon by false and misleading reports, and in place of having millions unemployed the country will clamor for labor, not only the farmer in the West and in the South but the manufacturer, the mill owner, and many industries all over the United States will be appealing to us for relief.

But I realize that it matters not what I may say or how defective this bill is. Owing to the prejudice that now exists, this measure will become a law. But nevertheless I feel it my duty to point out to you the erroneous and unjustifiable provisions of this bill.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman is familiar with the immigration law?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; in a measure.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the child of an American-born citizen or the child of a naturalized citizen who has resided in this country can come to this country irrespective of this bill or any legislation?

Mr. SABATH. Then why do you put the provisions in this bill?

Mr. RAKER. For the reason that under section 5 of the immigration act of March 2, 1907, it provides:

SEC. 5. That a child born without the United States of alien parents shall be deemed a citizen of the United States by virtue of the naturalization of or resumption of American citizenship by the parent: *Provided*, That such naturalization or resumption takes place during the minority of such child: *And provided further*, That the citizenship of such minor child shall begin at the time such minor child begins to reside permanently in the United States.

Mr. SABATH. In the United States there are thousands of these cases—children of American citizens who do not reside as yet in the United States, but who desire to come and reside here, but who had no chance or opportunity as yet to come to the United States. It is for that reason I say it is a mistake that you do not exempt from the operation of this law the children of American naturalized citizens. The provision that the gentleman has read shows that my contention is correct.



Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this bill will preclude the reunion of families. During the war there were thousands of now American citizens who became American citizens during the war while serving in our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who as yet have been unable to send for their wives or children who are still over there. They are clamoring day after day, appealing to the Department of State and the Immigration Department to secure visés for them so that they may come. I give you my word as a man that I have at least 100 applications of American citizens who served our country during the war who are appealing to me and pleading that I aid them in securing visés for their families to enable them to bring them here. This bill makes it absolutely impossible for any of them to come if the 3 per cent limit is reached before the applications which they have filed are acted upon. It is for that reason that I believe the conference report should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, some well-inclined men who feel as I do, that we make good our promises to our boys whom we encouraged to enlist and fight for our country, inquire why have they not brought their wives and children over to this country before this time. To them I wish to say, because they had no opportunity of doing so. A great majority of the 400,000 aliens who served our country during the war in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps volunteered, and the balance refused to claim exemption from service, resided in the United States only a few short years, coming here during the years 1910 to 1914, and due to economic conditions in 1913 and 1914 they were unable to send for their wives and children and were prevented from doing so after the outbreak of the war in 1914. Two hundred and fifty-six thousand of these aliens serving in our armed forces during the war became naturalized citizens. Very few of these 400,000 were officers, and consequently they had very little left from their pay as privates. Many of them after being released from the service were unable to secure immediate employment, and consequently have been unable to send for their wives and children, saying nothing about their parents and younger brothers and sisters, and even those who found opportunity to accumulate sufficient sums to send for them have been unable in many instances to secure passports from the country of their birth, and in many other instances where passports have been obtained they have been unable to secure the visé of the passports by our consular representatives. Those are the reasons why there are still so many of the wives and children of our service men waiting to be reunited with their fathers and their husbands, which this bill makes impossible.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has inquired whether it will be possible, under the provisions of this bill, to admit political or religious refugees. As I stated before, under the House bill those who could prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer and to the Secretary of Labor that they are actually subjects of religious persecution of the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States solely to avoid the suffering or hardship included in such persecution could come. But the conferees have struck out this provision, and for the first time in the history of our Nation we are going to refuse a haven of refuge to the unfortunate peoples who are persecuted, tortured, and massacred because they believe in worshipping God in accordance with the teachings of their fathers and a class of people who at all times look to this great country of ours for refuge.

Oh, gentlemen, if a similar law were enacted in the seventeenth, eighteenth, or nineteenth centuries, the Huguenots and the Pilgrim Fathers would have been debarred from the shores of this land. Yes, I regret, my colleagues, that they can not come, nor can the political refugee come under the provisions of this bill, or even under our present and still enforced wartime legislation, which has conveniently been extended in the interest, as it appears to me, to the remaining rulers of Europe, as under the passport regulations, even without this legislation, anyone guilty of lese majesty would naturally be refused a passport, and without the sanction of the king no passport would be issued him, and without a passport he can not enter the United States.

The House bill had one other reasonable provision which exempted from the 3 per cent resident aliens of the United States who returned from a temporary visit abroad; but that provision has been eliminated and they therefore will be counted in the 3 per cent limit. So the bill is the same harsh measure that passed the Senate in the Sixty-sixth Congress and which was properly pocket vetoed by President Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I can not help but state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX] and to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], who are so fearful of the Mexican

immigration, why have you exempted Mexico from the operation of this bill? Do you consider Mexican labor more reliable than the European labor? Personally I am of the opinion that you can not justly entertain that belief because nearly all of those who have pleaded for relief and for the suspension of the literacy test to secure Mexican labor claimed they could not secure Europe labor. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has also laid great stress on the fact that over 7,000 immigrants have been deported or debarred in the last 60 days, which again proves what I have maintained at all times, that if the present immigration laws were efficiently administered immigration could be reduced and that no undesirables or trouble makers could possibly enter our gates, and there could be no possible excuse for this hasty, ill-considered, discriminatory, and un-American legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time for the purpose of again pointing out what I think is a clear contradiction in the terms of this conference report. On page 2 it is provided in exception 8 that "aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States" shall not be counted. That is, alien children. I have a constituent, a naturalized citizen, who has a wife and daughters, one 10 and one 14 years of age, in Poland. The mother died from exposure, wandering about in the Ukraine. They can not come to this country, although he has been a citizen for four years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why can not he come?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Wait a moment. By the proviso on page 3 it is—

*Provided further,* That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of the United States.

That is, not only alien minor children but all minor children of citizens of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A child born over the seas is not a citizen of the United States. If the gentleman will get that in his mind, it will make things as clear as the skies.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I see no clearing up when one section provides an absolute exemption, and says that the law shall not apply to alien children under 18 years of age of citizens of the United States, and the next section provides—

that in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to children under 18 years of age of citizens of the United States.

One section provides an absolute right, the other only preferential treatment "so far as possible."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of no quorum. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and as many as are in favor of agreeing to the conference report will, when their names are called, say "aye," and those opposed "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 33, answered "present" 1, not voting 120, as follows:

## YEAS—276.

Ackerman	Bulwinkle	Dallinger	Foster
Almon	Burroughs	Darrow	Frear
Andrews	Burtress	Davis, Minn.	French
Arentz	Burton	Davis, Tenn.	Frothingham
Aswell	Butler	Dempsey	Fulmer
Atkeson	Byrnes, S. C.	Denison	Garner
Bankhead	Byrns, Tenn.	Dickinson	Garrett, Tenn.
Barbour	Cable	Dominick	Garrett, Tex.
Beck	Cannon	Doughton	Gerner
Beedy	Cantrill	Dowell	Good
Begg	Carter	Drane	Goodykoontz
Bell	Chalmers	Drewry	Graham, Ill.
Benham	Chandler, Okla.	Driver	Green, Iowa
Bixler	Chindblom	Dunbar	Griest
Black	Christopherson	Dupré	Hadley
Blakeley	Clarke, N. Y.	Dyer	Hammer
Bland, Ind.	Clouse	Echols	Hardy, Colo.
Bland, Va.	Cole	Elliott	Harrison
Blanton	Collins	Elston	Hawley
Boles	Colton	Evans	Hayden
Bowling	Connally, Tex.	Fairchild	Hays
Box	Connell	Fairfield	Herrick
Brand	Connolly, Pa.	Faust	Hersey
Briggs	Cooper, Ohio	Fess	Himes
Brooks, Ill.	Coughlin	Fisher	Hoch
Brooks, Pa.	Crisp	Fitzgerald	Houghton
Brown, Tenn.	Curry	Focht	Huddleston

Hudspeth	Linthicum	Oipp	Spruill
Hull	Little	Osborne	Stafford
Humphreys	Logan	Overstreet	Stegall
Husted	Longworth	Padgett	Stedman
Ireland	Lowrey	Park, Ga.	Steenerson
James, Mich.	Luce	Parker, N. J.	Stephens
James, Va.	Luhning	Parker, N. Y.	Stevenson
Jefferis	Lyon	Parks, Ark.	Strong, Kans.
Johnson, Ky.	McArthur	Parrish	Summers, Wash.
Johnson, Miss.	McClintic	Patterson, Mo.	Summers, Tex.
Johnson, S. Dak.	McCormick	Porter	Swank
Johnson, Wash.	McDuffie	Pou	Sweet
Jones, Pa.	McFadden	Pringley	Swing
Jones, Tex.	McKenzie	Purnell	Taylor, N. J.
Kearns	McLaughlin, Mich.	Quin	Temple
Keller	McSwain	Radcliffe	Thomas
Kelly, Pa.	Madden	Raker	Tillman
Ketcham	Magee	Ramseyer	Timberlake
Kincheloe	Mages	Rankin	Tyson
King	Martin	Rayburn	Underhill
Kirkpatrick	Merritt	Reavis	Vinon
Kissel	Michener	Reber	Volgt
Klecza	Miller	Reeco	Volstead
Kline, N. Y.	Mills	Reed, N. Y.	Walters
Kline, Pa.	Millsbaugh	Rhodes	Wason
Knutson	Montague	Ricketts	Watson
Kopp	Montoya	Roach	Weaver
Kraus	Moore, Ill.	Robertson	Webster
Kunz	Moore, Ohio	Robison	White, Kans.
Lampert	Moore, Va.	Rouse	Williamson
Langley	Morgan	Sanders, Ind.	Wilson
Lanham	Mott	Sanders, Tex.	Wingo
Lankford	Murphy	Sandlin	Winslow
Larsen, Ga.	Nelson, A. P.	Schall	Wood, Ind.
Lawrence	Nelson, J. M.	Scott, Tenn.	Woodruff
Layton	Newton, Minn.	Shaw	Woods, Va.
Lazaro	Newton, Mo.	Shelton	Woodyard
Lee, Calif.	Norton	Sinnot	Wright
Leatherwood	O'Connor	Smith	Wyrtzbach
Lee, Ga.	Ogden	Smithwick	Yates
Leibach	Oldfield	Snell	Young
Lineberger	Oliver	Speaks	Zihlman

## NAYS—33.

Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Mason	Tague
Cooper, Wis.	Griffin	Mead	Ten Eyck
Cullen	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ind.	Tilson
Edmonds	Hawes	O'Brien	Varo
Favrot	Hill	Rainey, Ill.	Walsh
Fenn	Hogan	Riordan	Ward, N. C.
Freeman	Kindred	Ryan	
Gensman	London	Sabath	
Glynn	MacGregor	Siegel	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Collier

## NOT VOTING—120.

Anderson	Ellis	Kreider	Rucker
Ansorge	Fields	Larson, Minn.	Sanders, N. Y.
Anthony	Fish	Lee, N. Y.	Scott, Mich.
Appleby	Flood	Lufkin	Sears
Bacharach	Fordney	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shreve
Barkley	Free	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sinclair
Bird	Fuller	McPherson	Sisson
Bond	Funk	Maloney	Slemp
Bowers	Gahn	Mann	Snyder
Brennan	Gallivan	Mansfield	Stiness
Brinson	Gilbert	Michaelson	Stoll
Britten	Goldsborough	Mondell	Strong, Pa.
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	Morin	Sullivan
Buchanan	Gould	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Burdick	Graham, Pa.	Nolan	Taylor, Tenn.
Burke	Greene, Vt.	Paige	Thompson
Campbell, Kans.	Haugen	Patterson, N. J.	Tincher
Campbell, Pa.	Hickey	Perkins	Tinkham
Carew	Hicks	Perlman	Towner
Clague	Hukriede	Peters	Treadway
Clark, Fla.	Hutchinson	Petersen	Upshaw
Classon	Jacoway	Rainey, Ala.	Valle
Cockran	Kahn	Ransley	Vestal
Codd	Kelley, Mich.	Reed, W. Va.	Volk
Copley	Kendall	Riddick	Ward, N. Y.
Cramton	Kennedy	Rodenberg	Wheeler
Crowther	Kiess	Rogers	White, Me.
Dale	Kinkaid	Rose	Williams
Deal	Kitchin	Rosenbloom	Wise
Dunn	Knight	Rossdale	Wyant

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. THOMPSON (for) with Mr. GALLIVAN (against).  
 Mr. MICHAELSON (for) with Mr. COCKRAN (against).  
 Mr. PAIGE (for) with Mr. VOLK (against).  
 Mr. VAILE (for) with Mr. PERLMAN (against).  
 Mr. HUKRIEDE (for) with Mr. ANSORGE (against).  
 Mr. SISSON (for) with Mr. ROSSDALE (against).  
 Mr. MCPHERSON (for) with Mr. SULLIVAN (against).  
 Mr. HICKEY (for) with Mr. CAREW (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. COLLIER.  
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. SEARS.  
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. FLOOD.  
 Mr. TINCHER with Mr. MANSFIELD.  
 Mr. WHEELER with Mr. BARKLEY.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. FREE with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. SHREVE with Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. WISE.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. WYANT with Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. DEAL.

Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. ELLIS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. ROGERS with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY. I wish to withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present." The name of Mr. COLLIER was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet on Monday, May 16, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

128. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting itemized report of audit of accounts of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committee, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KINKAID, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4396) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 66), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. APPLEBY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5749) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 67), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12) to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 68), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5968) for the relief of Maud Sheffey, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.



## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLOUSE: A bill (H. R. 6197) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a United States reformatory prison in connection with a farm; to provide for the imprisonment and employment of certain United States prisoners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) authorizing the erection of a public building in the city of Livingston, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) authorizing the erection of a public building in the city of Dayton, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6200) to authorize the provision of accommodations for the United States courts in the Federal building at Sunbury, Pa., and to increase the limit of cost for said building accordingly; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6201) to exclude certain alien immigrants from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONTOLA: A bill (H. R. 6202) to provide for the enlargement of the United States Federal building at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) to appropriate the sum of \$2,026.44 to reimburse the city of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, for paving done around the Federal building in said city; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRINGEY: A bill (H. R. 6204) to grant the military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6205) to amend section 177 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 6206) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 6207) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended, to establish a Hawaiian homes commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power within the district of Hamakua, on the island and in the county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power, within the district of Hana, on the island and in the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved March 28, 1916; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii entitled, "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize and provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway or railways in the district of Honolulu, island of Oahu,' enacted by the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii, July 7, 1898, and granting a franchise to the Honolulu Rapid Transit & Land Co. to operate a street railway in the district of Honolulu, providing for the operation of the same, and providing for the purchase of the same by the city and county of Honolulu"; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6212) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to proceedings in contested-election cases; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 6213) to amend the revenue act of 1918 in relation to the estates of soldiers and sailors who were killed or died in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6214) authorizing the distribution of abandoned or forfeited tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes to hospitals maintained by the United States for the use of present or former members of the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 6215) to amend an act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 6216) directing the War Department to cancel claim for certain property furnished the Texas National Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KISSEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) creating a joint commission to be known as the joint commission of agricultural inquiry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REBER: Resolution (H. Res. 91) authorizing a clerk for the Committee on Mileage; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 6217) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bettsville, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 6218) granting a pension to Hester Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLOUSE: A bill (H. R. 6219) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of George W. Raney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Davidson, Tenn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 6221) for the relief of Francis M. Atherton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 6223) for the relief of New York State; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 6224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jonesboro, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Randleman, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Asheboro, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sanford, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Thomasville, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hamlet, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yadkinville, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockingham, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Wilkesboro, State of North Caro-



lina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ramseur, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Troy, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Liberty, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wadesboro, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wilkesboro, State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 6240) for the relief of Fred L. Waldron, Limited; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6241) to correct the military title of Fred R. Nugent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 6242) granting a pension to Clara Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6243) granting a pension to Patient Wilder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6244) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew Allmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of Dr. O. H. Tittmann, former Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to Elizabeth Denges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6247) granting a pension to Josephine McCready; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSENBLOOM: A bill (H. R. 6248) granting a pension to Kate Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6249) granting an increase of pension to Charles McClaren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6250) for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co.; and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6251) for the relief of Leo Balsam; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 6252) granting a pension to August M. Wehe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 6253) granting a pension to John Prickett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

674. By Mr. APPLEBY: Petition of the Lions' Club of New Brunswick, N. J., favoring protective tariff on eggs and poultry; also petition from citizens of New Jersey, praying for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

675. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of the Women's Auxiliary, Post No. 11, American Legion, Gardnerville, Nev., urging relief for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

676. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of the Ohio Women's Christian Temperance Union, Columbus, Ohio, praying for the passage of House bill 5033; also indorsing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

677. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petitions of Council of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic and State Council of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, representing thousands of citizens of North Dakota, protesting against the United States joining the international council with England while she is engaged in murderous repression of liberty in Ireland; also petition of citizens of Williston, N. Dak., urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

678. By Mr. COCKRAN: Petition of the Edward I. Tinkham Post, No. 598, American Legion, urging relief for the disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

679. By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: Petitions from the Second Girard Avenue Building Association and the Concrete Building and Loan Association, both of Philadelphia, Pa., urging exemption from taxation of annual incomes from building and loan associations to the extent of \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

680. Also, petition from the Hermann Building and Loan Association, No. 1, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging exemption from taxation of annual incomes from building and loan associations to the extent of \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

681. Also, petition from the Lessing Building Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging exemption from taxation of incomes from building and loan associations to the extent of \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

682. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Sacramento Post, No. 61, Sacramento; Lodi Post, No. 22, Lodi; Sacramento High Chapter, No. 31, A. F. of T., Sacramento; and the Richmond Chapter of War Mothers, Richmond, all in the State of California, urging relief for the soldiers disabled by the war, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

683. Also, petition of the Earl Fruit Co., of Sacramento, and the California Grape Protective Association, and California Grape Growers' Exchange, of San Francisco, all in the State of California, favoring the purchase by the Government of the experimental vineyards at Fresno and Oakville; to the Committee on Agriculture.

684. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Women's Auxiliary of Post No. 15, American Legion, Stoneham, Mass., urging relief for the disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

685. By Mr. FENN: Petitions of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and the veterans of the World War of the same ancestry, of Glastonbury, Conn., relative to conditions now existing in Galicia, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Also petition of the Seicheprey Post, No. 2, American Legion, and the women's auxiliary of the same post, and the Rau-Locke Post, No. 8, American Legion, of Hartford, Conn., favoring relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

686. By Mr. KIESS: Evidence in support of House bill 1613, granting an honorable discharge to John A. Odell; to the Committee on Military Affairs. Also petition of Enterprise Council, No. 136, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Muncy, Pa., favoring the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Also petition of the Kiwanis Club and the Williamsport Association of School Principals, urging relief for men and women of the World War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

687. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, New York City, urging the passage of House bill 4089 and Senate bill 847; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

688. Also, petition of W. N. Stevenson & Co., New York City, indorsing certain section in new tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. Also, petition of Austin, Nichols & Co., New York City, opposing House bill 5033; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

690. By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of 42 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

691. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petitions from rural mail carriers, Reedsville, Wis., covering pay of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

692. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of United Social Clubs, Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

693. Also, petition of O. S. Highbarger, Hagerstown, Md., protesting against tax on eyeglasses, etc.; also, petition of W. A. Scharper, Stewart & Co., Arnold Rosenfeld, and Gusdorff & Joseph, all of Baltimore, Md., favoring a sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

694. Also, petition of Boyden Steel Corporation, Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 210; to the Committee on Patents.

695. Also, petition of W. S. Hill, Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 4; to the Committee on Pensions.

696. Also, petition of Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, regarding difficulty in handling business between United States and France due to regulations of French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.



697. Also, petition of Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, protesting against House bill 5676; to the Committee on Agriculture.

698. Also, petition of Carr-Lowry Glass Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against House bill 4981; to the Committee on Agriculture.

699. By Mr. MONTROYA: Petition of the Pecos Valley Council, No. 2154, Knights of Columbia, of Roswell, N. Mex., against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; also, petition of the Clovis Women's Club, Clovis, N. Mex., in favor of the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

700. Also, petitions of the Albuquerque Lodge, No. 461, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and the Hugh A. Carlisle Post, No. 1, Albuquerque, N. Mex., urging relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

701. By Mr. REBER: Petition of Ukrainians of Minersville, Pa., relative to East Galicia and conditions existing there; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

702. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of New York City and Greater New York City, urging recognition of the Irish republic, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

703. By Mr. SINGLAIR: Telegram on behalf North Dakota State Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, protesting against America's ambassador joining England in international council while that country refuses to recognize the Irish republic; also similar telegram from Carrollton Council, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

704. Also, petition of North Dakota State Federation of Labor, protesting against the sales tax and repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

705. By Mr. SNELL: Resolution of the chamber of commerce, Port Henry, N. Y., relative to the care of disabled soldiers and indorsing the program of legislation asked by the American Legion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

706. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the Wrightstown Monthly Meeting of Friends, favoring cessation of Navy building program pending international disarmament conference; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 14, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that we are under such good guardianship as Thy infinite love and tenderness manifest toward us, and this morning we wish to bring our praises and thanksgiving to Thy throne, supplicating Thy aid through the duties of the day, and helping us to fulfill Thy gracious purpose. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, May 12, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit the immigration into the Territory of Hawaii of a sufficient number of persons, including orientals, as may be necessary to meet an existing labor shortage, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of the Women's Social and Suffrage Association of Porto Rico, praying for an amendment to the organic act of Porto Rico giving the right of vote to women, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburg and Fate, both in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit gambling in grain and other agricultural products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIS presented resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Ashtabula and the Advertising Club of Columbus, both in the State of Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Troy Wagon Works Co., of Troy, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation protecting the American automotive industry against dumping of salvaged European equipment on the American market, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted at meetings of citizens of Cleveland and London, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation for the recognition of the Irish republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial of General Pershing Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Grain Dealers' National Association, at the twenty-fourth annual convention held at Minneapolis, Minn., on October 11, 12, and 13, 1920, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the law creating the Federal Trade Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation standardizing all farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions of the Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, Post No. 234, of Hart; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Benton Harbor; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Bad Axe; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Mount Clemens; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Houghton; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Flint; and Carl Johnson Post, No. 2, American Legion, of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a petition of the Stephens Thomson Mason Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Ionia, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a national ocean-to-ocean highway over the pioneer trails of the Nation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Jackson Federation of Labor, of Jackson, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of Calumet Council, No. 1245, Knights of Columbus, of Calumet; Auxiliary Unit of Sherman Elvin Post, No. 96, of Bad Axe; Women's Auxiliary of Judson E. Ingram Post, No. 80, of Houghton; Ladies' Auxiliary of Oakley Traynor Post, No. 61, of Flint; Women's Auxiliary of Harry Oelrich Post, No. 4, of Mount Clemens; Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Benton Harbor; and Women's Auxiliary, American Legion, of Hart, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I present certain petitions and memorials signed by sundry citizens of California, praying for the enactment of legislation and providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men. There are two of these memorials or petitions, namely, one by the Concord Chamber of Commerce, Contra Costa County, Calif., and the other by the Central Labor Council of San Bernardino, Calif. I ask unanimous consent that these two may be printed in the Record. There are many others that I wish merely to present.

The designated petitions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas there has been brought to the attention of the Concord Chamber of Commerce, of Concord, Contra Costa County, Calif., the urgent need of a change in the situation concerning the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of the World War, and remedial action looking toward, to wit:

1. Adequate appropriations for the bureaus charged with caring for disabled ex-service men.

2. Appropriations to build the necessary hospitals.

3. Passage of the Rogers-Capper bill providing for consolidation of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Rehabilitation Section of the Public Health Service, and the Federal Board for Vocational Education—  
as evidenced by "A memorial from the American Legion to the President, the President elect, the Congress, and the people of the United States, directing attention to the situation which surrounds the rehabilitation of disabled ex-service men and suggesting a remedy"; and

Whereas said memorial was, at a regular meeting of said chamber of commerce held on the 2d day of February, A. D. 1921, on motion, duly seconded and unanimously carried, fully indorsed: Now therefore be it